

Association of American Colleges Bulletin

VOLUME XXXVIII

OCTOBER, 1952

NUMBER 3

Edited by

GUY E. SNAVELY

Executive Director of the Association

BERTHA TUMA

Assistant Editor

ELIZABETH HORN

Editorial Assistant

Published by the

Association of American Colleges

N. Queen St. and McGovern Ave., Lancaster, Pa.

Editorial Offices

726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

March, May, October, December

Annual Subscription, \$3.00

Entered as second class matter, March 15, 1926, at the post office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, embodied in Paragraph (d-2) Section 34.40 P. L. & B. of 1948.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1952-53

President: M. E. Sadler, President, Texas Christian University.

Vice President: John R. Cunningham, President, Davidson College.

Treasurer: R. H. Fitzgerald, Chancellor, University of Pittsburgh.

Executive Director: Guy E. Snavelly.

—*Executive Director Emeritus:* Robert L. Kelly, Claremont, California.

Board of Directors: (additional members) G. Herbert Smith, President, Willamette University; Clark G. Kuebler, President, Ripon College; Celestin J. Steiner, President, University of Detroit; Thomas E. Jones, President, Earlham College.

STANDING COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE: (1953)* Dean Millicent C. McIntosh, Barnard College; President Joe J. Mickle, Centenary College; President D. M. Nelson, Mississippi College; (1954) President Eugene S. Briggs, Phillips University, *Chairman*; President Robert H. Sweeney, University of Portland; President George D. Grice, College of Charleston; (1955) President Louis T. Benezet, Allegheny College; President Rufus E. Clement, Atlanta University; President John Scott Everton, Kalamazoo College.

COMMISSION ON THE ARTS: (1953) President Harry L. Dillin, Linfield College; President Paul D. Eddy, Adelphi College; President Irwin J. Lubbers, Hope College; President Robert N. Montgomery, Muskingum College; (1954) President John T. Caldwell, University of Arkansas; President Calvert N. Ellis, Juniata College, *Chairman*; President H. Gary Hudson, Illinois College; (1955) President M. Dorothea Dunkerley, College of New Rochelle; President Rosemary Park, Connecticut College; President John L. Knight, Baldwin Wallace College; President Paul M. Pitman, College of Idaho.

COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION: (1953) President Katherine G. Blyley, Keuka College; President Howard F. Lowry, College of Wooster; President Clyde A. Milner, Guilford College, *Chairman*; President Comerford O'Malley, DePaul University; President Edwin E. Voigt, Simpson College; (1954) Secretary E. Fay Campbell, Presbyterian Board of Christian Education; President Matt L. Ellis, Hendrix College; President William G. Ryan, Seton Hill College; President Harlie L. Smith, Board of Education, Disciples of Christ; President Andrew G. Truxal, Hood College; (1955) President W. A. Bell, Miles College; President Carl M. Reinert, Creighton University; President V. F. Schwalm, Manchester College; President Clarence C. Stoughton, Wittenberg College; President Harold W. Tribble, Wake Forest College; Secretary General Frederick G. Hochwalt, National Catholic Educational Association, *ex officio*; General Director Raymond F. McLain, Commission on Christian Higher Education, Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A., *ex officio*.

* Note: Term expires on date indicated.

COMMISSION ON COLLEGES AND INDUSTRY: (1953) President David A. Lockmiller, University of Chattanooga; President Joseph B. N. Maxwell, Boston College; President Frank Hugh Sparks, Wabash College, *Chairman*; (1954) President Morgan S. Odell, Lewis and Clark College; President Samuel S. Stratton, Middlebury College; (1955) President William W. Hall, Jr., Westminster College; President J. Gordon Howard, Otterbein College; President Harold E. Stassen, University of Pennsylvania.

COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES: (1953) President Robert P. Daniel, Virginia State College; President, William W. Edel, Dickinson College; President Edward J. Sparling, Roosevelt College; (1954) President, William S. Carlson, State University of New York; President Francis X. N. McGuire, Villanova College; President Peyton N. Rhodes, Southwestern; (1955) Vice Chancellor LeRoy E. Kimball, New York University, *Chairman*; President R. McA. Lloyd, Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association; President Ernest L. Wilkinson, Brigham Young University.

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL RELATIONS: (1953) President Bowman F. Ashe, University of Miami; Sister Catherine Dorothea, Trinity College (Washington); President David L. Crawford, Doane College; President Albert W. Dent, Dillard University; President John L. McMahon, Our Lady of the Lake College; (1954) President J. Ollie Edmunds, Stetson University; President Walter C. Langsam, Wagner College; President Spencer Miller, Jr., American International College, *Chairman*; President G. Herbert Smith, Willamette University; (1955) President Wallace M. Alston, Agnes Scott College; President Jaime Benitez, University of Puerto Rico; President Edgar G. Gammon, Hampden-Sydney College; President William J. Scarborough, West Virginia Wesleyan College; President Gregg M. Sinclair, University of Hawaii.

COMMISSION ON LIBERAL EDUCATION: (1953) President Laurence M. Gould, Carleton College; President Harlan H. Hatcher, University of Michigan; President Charles S. Johnson, Fisk University; President James F. Maguire, Xavier University (Ohio); President Gilbert F. White, Haverford College; (1954) President J. Seelye Bixler, Colby College; President Gordon K. Chalmers, Kenyon College; President Charles W. Cole, Amherst College; President Hunter Guthrie, Georgetown University; President John W. Nason, Swarthmore College; (1955) President James P. Baxter III, Williams College; Director Charles E. Odegard, American Council of Learned Societies; President Nathan M. Pusey, Lawrence College, *Chairman*; President Richard D. Weigle, St. John's College (Maryland); President William W. Whitehouse, Albion College.

COMMISSION ON MINORITY GROUPS IN HIGHER EDUCATION: (1953) President J. Hillis Miller, University of Florida; President Rollo C. LaPorte, University of Dubuque; President Douglas McGregor, Antioch College; President Charles F. Phillips, Bates College; (1954) President Ambrose J. Burke, St. Ambrose College; President, Alonzo G. Moron, Hampton Institute; President Anne Gary Pannell, Sweet Briar College; President G. Morris Smith, Susquehanna University; (1955) President Robert E. Burns,

College of the Pacific; President Carlyle Campbell, Meredith College; President Bernhard Christensen, Augsburg College; Mother Eleanor M. O'Byrne, Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, *Chairman*.

COMMISSION ON PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION: (1953) President Leonard Carmichael, Tufts College; President John M. Gallalee, University of Alabama; President Goodrich C. White, Emory University; (1954) President Samuel Belkin, Yeshiva University; President Laurence J. McGinley, Fordham University; President Robert F. Thompson, College of Puget Sound; (1955) President Mordecai W. Johnson, Howard University; President O. P. Kretzmann, Valparaiso University, *Chairman*; President James Roscoe Miller, Northwestern University.

COMMISSION ON PUBLIC RELATIONS: (1953) President Margaret Clapp, Wellesley College; President Harry V. Masters, Albright College; President Vincent J. Flynn, College of St. Thomas; President Walter C. Giersbach, Pacific University, *Chairman*; (1954) President Otto F. Kraushaar, Goucher College; President John A. O'Brien, College of the Holy Cross; President David B. Owen, Bradley University; President Norman P. Auburn, University of Akron; (1955) President Doak S. Campbell, Florida State University; President Robert C. Grier, Erskine College; President Lincoln B. Hale, Evansville College; President M. Lafayette Harris, Philander Smith College.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION: (1953) President Paul R. Anderson, Pennsylvania College for Women; President Carey Croneis, Beloit College; President Roswell G. Ham, Mount Holyoke College; President Merrill J. Holmes, Illinois Wesleyan University; (1954) President Sister M. Columkille, Incarnate Word College; President William J. Dunne, University of San Francisco; President Hardy Liston, Johnson C. Smith University; President Lawrence M. Stavig, Augustana College, (S. Dak.); (1955) President Russell D. Cole, Cornell College, *Chairman*; President Paul H. Fall, Hiram College; President Ewald B. Lawson, Upsala College; President John J. Theobald, Queens College (New York).

EMERGENCY COMMITTEE ON COOPERATION WITH NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS: Arthur G. Coons, Occidental College, *Chairman*; President Horace Mann Bond, Lincoln University; President Eugene S. Briggs, Phillips University; President Victor L. Butterfield, Wesleyan University; President Rufus H. Fitzgerald, University of Pittsburgh; President Laurence M. Gould, Carleton College; President Clyde A. Milner, Guilford College; President Paul C. Reinert, St. Louis University; President Hubert Searcy, Huntingdon College.

REPRESENTATIVES ON AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION: (1953) President Vincent J. Flynn, College of St. Thomas; (1954) Chancellor Daniel L. Marsh, Boston University; (1955) Vice Chancellor LeRoy E. Kimball, New York University.

REPRESENTATIVES ON NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ACCREDITING: (1953) President Arthur G. Coons, Occidental College; Executive Director Guy E.

Snively; (1954) President Vincent J. Flynn, College of St. Thomas; President Samuel S. Stratton, Middlebury College; (1955) President Theodore H. Jack, Randolph-Macon Woman's College; President Cloyd H. Marvin, George Washington University.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS: The President, *ex officio*; The Vice President, *ex officio*; The Executive Director, *ex officio*.

CONTENTS

Editorial Notes	377
To Teach Wisdom, <i>Harold W. Dodds</i>	385
Language Study and World Affairs, <i>Earl J. McGrath</i>	389
What Difference Will Your College Education Make?, <i>Ordway Tead</i>	399
Why Such Lack of Good Written English among College Students?, <i>I. N. Carr</i>	408
Potentials for Prosperity in West Virginia, <i>M. J. Horsch</i>	412
Development of Higher Education in Pakistan, <i>Walter Crosby Eells</i>	421
General Education and Counseling, <i>Paul L. Dressel</i>	428
The Knack for Success in Continuous Fund Raising, <i>Paul H. Davis</i>	433
Book Review: A Prairie Saga, <i>Samuel S. George</i>	438
Among the Colleges	440
New College Presidents	443

COLLEGE AND CHURCH

Catholic Educators and Public Education, <i>Paul C. Reinert</i> ..	446
Can Religious Education Be Patriotic, <i>Andrew C. Rockover</i>	449
Perspectives Which Challenge and Threaten, <i>Walter Pope Binns</i>	453
Why the Christian College?, <i>Barend H. Kroeze</i>	457
Editorial Items	469

The BULLETIN is published four times a year—in March, May, October and December. Its emphasis is on description and exposition, not primarily on criticism or controversy. The March issue regularly carries the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association. Leaders in the college world contribute to every issue.

Annual Subscription Rates: Regular \$3.00; to members of Association colleges special rates are offered: individual subscriptions, \$1.00; ten or more club subscriptions, mailed in one package for distribution at the college, 50 cents each. Address the Association of American Colleges, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

EDITORIAL NOTES

NOTRE DAME is "the story of a great university" by Richard

Sullivan, a graduate of the class of 1930. He has been on the faculty for sixteen years and is now Associate Professor of English. His sympathetic and illuminating story holds the reader in the same thrall as does the perusal of a romantic love story. He has attained previous literary success as the author of four novels and a collection of short stories. In **NOTRE DAME** Author Sullivan gives appropriately much space to the Reverend Edward Frederick Sorin, the Catholic priest, who with seven Brothers came from France in 1842 to set up a school at Notre Dame du Lac in northern Indiana on a tract of land of some 400 acres handed over for the purpose by the Bishop of Vincennes.

The school was chartered as a university on January 15, 1844 by the State of Indiana. The character of the rugged individualist Sorin is lovingly portrayed. His persistence carried him over unusually rough spots, including the rebuilding of Notre Dame after its destruction by a disastrous fire in 1879, when Father Sorin had become the Superior-General of the Congregation of Holy Cross.

Distinguished priest presidents to succeed Father Sorin were John Zahm, James Burns, William Corby, John W. Cavanaugh, J. Hugh O'Donnell and John J. Cavanaugh. The last, who retires shortly after six years of a conspicuous presidency, is no kin to Father John W. Cavanaugh who was president for 14 years, before the presidential limitation was set at six years. Casually does the author record that Albert Zahm, younger brother of Father Zahm was a recognized pioneer in the field of aviation; that the first to send a wireless message was another lay faculty member, Jerome D. Greene; that the work of Father Julius Nieuwland, chemist and botanist, led to the discovery of lewisite and synthetic rubber; that, and with less casualness in the reporting, Knute Rockne was an unexcelled football coach. Henry Holt and Company, New York.

PRELUDE TO THE FUTURE is the well-written history of **THE FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF HIRAM COLLEGE, 1850-1950**, by Professor Mary Bosworth Trendley of Wellesley

College. The persistence of pioneer settlers from New England in the Portage County section of the Western Reserve started and kept alive during its early days of terrific stress a college at Hiram, Ohio, which has attained distinction as a "good small college." Its most famous alumnus, James A. Garfield, who graduated from Hiram before it was a standard college, went on to Williams in 1854 to obtain his A.B. degree in 1856. He returned that fall to become professor of ancient languages, acting president in 1857, head of the school from 1858 until 1863, advisory principal 1865-67, trustee from 1867 until his assassination in 1881, when President of the United States. On the side he studied law, served in the Ohio Senate during winter months of 1859-61, preached every Sunday in nearby churches during the periods he stayed on the campus before leaving as an officer in the Union Army. He was a minister of the Church of the Disciples of Christ.

Other leading members of this Church had much to do with the founding and continued growth of Hiram College. A former president of the Association of American Colleges, Kenneth I. Brown, was president of Hiram College from 1930 to 1940. He introduced the Hiram Study of Intensive Courses whereby a student carries for a nine weeks' quarter one intensive course and one running course, thus completing in a year the five courses covered in a year of the conventional college program. Brown's predecessor was Miner Lee Bates who served from 1908 to 1930. He brought the institution to national recognition. After distinguished service as professor of chemistry at Hiram and Williams Colleges, Paul H. Fall became Hiram's president in 1940. During his presidency Hiram has been strengthened greatly, in spite of the serious disturbances wrought by the impact of World War II. Association Press, New York.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, 1851-1951, by James

Gray, relates critically and sympathetically the trials and tribulations but steady successes experienced by the seven distinguished presidents who served at the helm of the University previous to the present incumbent, James Lewis Morrill. From his success as author of numerous novels, plays and histories, and, more recently, as professor of English at the University, biogra-

pher Gray enlivens his intriguing record with human-interest stories and revealing analyses of the personalities of his beloved "prexies." Likewise, the reader is led to appreciate the ability of effective deans, division and department chiefs and distinguished scholars, many of whom rendered conspicuous service to state and nation in time of war and to their colleagues in higher education, by devising and carrying to success a number of helpful educational reforms and programs. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

OPPORTUNITIES IN TEACHING by Benjamin Fine, Education Editor of *The New York Times* is a manual in the Vocational Guidance series concerned with opportunities and suggestions for those entering the professional field of teaching. Vocational Guidance Manuals, 45 West 45th Street, New York 36, N. Y.

THE COLLEGES AND THE COURTS 1946-50 by M. M. Chambers is a well-written and thorough study of court decisions affecting higher education in the period between 1946 and 1950. Of especial interest to administrators in the field of education, this, the fourth in a series of books which condense court decisions concerning higher education since 1936, analyzes the general trends in the decisions. Dr. Chambers is well qualified to do this, having taught educational administration and political science for many years. Columbia University Press, New York.

AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES, 1952 Sixth Edition, edited by Mary Irwin is a thorough and comprehensive guide giving pertinent information about 904 accredited colleges and universities in the United States, Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico. This useful handbook has been published every four years since 1928 when it first contained material about 399 institutions. The new edition presents the colleges alphabetically by states, has data on veterans and foreign students and a listing of Army, Navy and Air Force ROTC Units. It also gives brief descriptions of 1,812 professional schools in 20 fields. There is much useful material on the regional accrediting associations, academic costume code and distribution of doctorates. This in-

valuable reference book is published by The American Council on Education, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and sells for \$10.

AERICAN JUNIOR COLLEGES, 1952 Third Edition, edited by Jesse P. Bogue, is an excellent directory with descriptive data on 575 accredited junior colleges in the United States. The first edition in 1940 listed 494 institutions. The schools are classified alphabetically by states and much information is given about their history, requirements for entrance and graduation, fees, etc. American Council on Education, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Washington 6, D. C., \$7.50.

FUNDS AND FOUNDATIONS is an intimate picture, sometimes frankly critical, of the evolution of our larger educational foundations, from the pen of Abraham Flexner who spent most of his life as an officer in both the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations. Mrs. Esther S. Bailey, for many years Flexner's secretary, collaborated in the authorship of the book.

Most interesting are the summary sketches of the Freedmen's Bureau and the Peabody Fund, considered by the authors to be the real forerunners of the large foundations. Major General Oliver O. Howard is pictured as a poor director of the former, while high praise is given to J. L. M. Curry as successful head of the Peabody Fund.

Unreserved is the merited tribute paid Frederick T. Gates and Wallace Buttrick for their vision in developing the policies of the General Education Board and the Rockefeller Foundation. Forthright are the criticisms of later heads of these foundations who seem to fail to "keep to the high roads" but "wander off into rabbit paths; foundations must 'bunch their hits,' not scatter their fire like buckshot."

The portrayal of the evolution of the policies of the Carnegie Corporation and the Carnegie Foundation is given sympathetically though criticism is not spared when grants seem to be made by "shot gun method." Praise is given Frederick Paul Keppel for his keen interest in adult education and the fine arts when president of the Carnegie Corporation.

Striking and apropos are the observations in the last chapter

on "The Neglect of the Humanities." "The thoughtful reader of these pages must have been struck by the crying inadequacy of the funds devoted to humanistic studies—to languages, literature, art, archeology, philosophy, music, history." Harper and Brothers, New York.

A PRAIRIE SAGA, reviewed elsewhere in this issue of the Bulletin, is fascinating reading for anyone who has had the high adventure of presiding over the destinies of a small college. Its author, B. H. Kroeze, was a college president for forty-one years. He was a founding member of the Association of American Colleges, representing Jamestown College of North Dakota. He served on Association committees and received in 1936 from the Association a citation for "Distinguished Services in the Cause of Higher Education." A chapter from the SAGA appears in the COLLEGE AND CHURCH section of this issue.

THE COOPERATIVE BUREAU FOR TEACHERS, 1776 Broadway, New York, announces the appointment of Sidney J. French, Dean of the Faculty, Colgate University, as Chairman of the Governing Board for 1952-54 and Louis T. Benezet, President of Allegheny College, Chairman of the Bureau's College Committee to work with the staff for the establishment of better placement procedures.

SARGENT GUIDE TO PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES AND SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES gives helpful information to the prospective student about leading junior colleges, senior colleges and specialized schools, in summary form. Porter Sargent, 11 Beacon Street, Boston 8, Massachusetts.

TOWARD LIBERAL EDUCATION and INTRODUCTION TO LITERATURE are revised editions of two excellent anthologies first published in 1948. Edited by Louis G. Locke, William M. Gibson and George Arms, the first volume is concerned with the skills of a liberal education, such as learning, reading, writing and thinking. The second volume presents literature of the imagination. Rinehart & Company, New York.

THE DANFORTH FOUNDATION announces a program of graduate fellowships based on the conviction that one of the major needs of American education is for a larger number of well-trained teachers, particularly at the college level, who see in the vocation of teaching their special form of Christian service. The First Class of Danforth Graduate Fellows, appointed in May 1952, includes approximately 50 men and women who will begin their graduate study in September 1952 in a variety of institutions and in a variety of subject matter fields. The Danforth Foundation will supplement their own resources, as there may be need, after the Fellows have secured for themselves all available scholarship and fellowship aid. Some appointees are "Fellows without stipend," where there is no financial need. They are assured of all the privileges of membership in the group even though there be no financial grant.

THE JOHN HAY WHITNEY FOUNDATION announces six awards to outstanding retired professors who will continue teaching and consultative responsibilities at selected small liberal arts colleges for the academic year 1952-53. The Foundation plans a Registry of professors in the humanities who though retired wish to continue teaching. Salaries will be assumed by the Foundation and the college will provide housing for the visiting professor. Lectures, seminars and informal conferences with students and faculty will be included in the program to take advantage of the experience and wisdom of the retired professor and to enrich instruction in the humanities. While appointments of the six professors named will not extend beyond June 1953, selection of awardees will be made for the succeeding years. Candidates are proposed by presidents, deans or faculty colleagues rather than by the professor himself. A Registry will be maintained at the Foundation from which information will be available without cost to presidents of colleges and universities considering the appointment of a professor retired by another institution.

GENERAL EDUCATION IN ACTION by B. Lamar Johnson is a report of a fourteen month study made of 57 California public junior colleges, their programs, courses, administra-

tion and relationship to the community. American Council on Education, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

TEACHING THROUGH RADIO AND TELEVISION by

William B. Levenson and Edward Stasheff is a revised edition of this volume which was first presented in 1945 to forward the use of television and radio programs for educational purposes. Many practical and useful suggestions are offered. Rinehart & Company, New York.

PROBLEMS OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION by Frank L. McVey and Raymond M. Hughes is

the latest addition to our growing library of books on college and university administration. Its authors have had a total of 56 years in presiding over the destinies of four outstanding universities. President McVey served eight years as President of the University of North Dakota and twenty-three years as President of the University of Kentucky. President Hughes served sixteen years as President of Miami University and nine years as President of Iowa State College. Their varied and successful experiences entitle them to advise on all the topics outlined in the Table of Contents; notably, the home life of the president; his fellowship with the trustees, faculty, students, alumni and legislators; buildings for the campus; the usage of the library and the chapel; the stimulation of research and graduate work; the importance of the teacher. Unlike that other recent fine book on college administration, "Colleges for Freedom" by Cowling and Davidson, the book is not exactly a joint effort but is made thought-provoking by the individual opinions of the two authors. These at times are somewhat different in outlook. President Hughes pulls no punches in discussing such puzzling problems as appointments and dismissals, the time an administrator should retire, a proposal for substituting vice presidents for deans, encouraging alumni gifts, developing plans for the encouragement of competent students to go into college teaching, approval of fraternities and religious organizations. President McVey, of course, concurs in most of the Hughes' proposals but is forthright in his opinion about fraternities, about the undue influ-

ence of accrediting groups and about the length of service a president should have. All younger presidents and many of those in service for some time will be enlightened and inspired to read this excellent work by two veteran university presidents. The Iowa State College Press, Ames, Iowa.

TO TEACH WISDOM

HAROLD W. DODDS

PRESIDENT, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

IF I were asked to describe in one phrase the most dangerous manifestation of our national psychology, I should say that it is a prevailing sense of insecurity. Indeed when people come together these days to talk about the future of the Republic they seem inevitably to lapse into fatalism, as if we were living under a subconscious sense of doom. The amount of time and money devoted these days to "hot-rod" pleasures, the level of current standards of sex relations, the immoderate use of alcohol as an escape or as a crutch; all these symptoms unite to suggest a national anxiety neurosis. For an individual such a mental state is dangerous and calls for prompt treatment; for a nation it can be catastrophic. We all need to guard against it no matter how stable we think ourselves to be.

The more new ways we discover for harnessing nature for the good of mankind, the more we fear that people will use the new knowledge to destroy each other. What we happily and proudly used to call the Engineering Age has turned itself into the Phenobarbital Age. And the reason seems to be a debilitating doubt in the strength of moral forces of our Western civilization to guide our destinies. Indeed for far too many people the skepticism extends further and questions the real existence of the very concepts of right and wrong, so devastating has been the worship of natural science as the way to salvation.

• • • •

What America needs particularly to guard against is that as we come to rely more and more on big complex organizations for our economic and social satisfactions, we do not move into the age of the mass mind. The workings of the mass mind are entirely different from the operations of the democratic mind. Hitler's Germany and the countries now within the circle of the

NOTE: Excerpts reprinted from *Princeton Alumni Weekly*, May 9, 1952 from an address given at the National Alumni Association banquet, Palmer House, Chicago, April 25.

Iron Curtain are examples of the mass mind at work. So when I denounce the mass mind I am not thinking at all of the operation of a true democracy which follows the familiar traditions and processes of popular government.

Even at the risk of being misunderstood and misinterpreted, I assert that if the Day of the Common Man brings us rule by the mass mind our way of life is moving into a new Dark Age.

The mass mind is not personal; it is not generous and considerate; it is selfish and self-centered. Its method is to impose its will by power, not by reason or by convincing others. In a true democracy the emphasis is on discussion, on "holding the arena open to all ideas," on "submitting them to scrutiny and debate not of experts only but of the whole population"; and by this process to arrive at an agreed decision. The mass mind does not reflect; it does not examine itself to see if it is right. Its weapon is power.

If an individual comes to think of himself only as a microscopic part of various huge organizations, as merely the product of vast forces imposed from without, and concludes that he can only realize himself as he is a member of a mass, his hope of security through his own efforts gives way to gnawing insecurity.

I argue that our preoccupation with the astounding riches of our modern comforts and convenience is modifying our ideals of human happiness and crippling the strength of a free society. The true ideal of happiness is not to be conceived merely in terms of scientific adjustment to physical environment. It is not a state of "frictionless ease," of flight from difficulties and fears. It is not "frictionless ease" which has inspired our science, our literature, our life or our religion.

The false ideal of "frictionless ease" inevitably spells stagnation and moral sickness. We rightfully condemn Russia's philosophy which subordinates morals to economics; but the question for America is whether by practicing materialism to the neglect of the spirit we are not riding for the same fall.

The American college has fallen short of its target as described in college catalogues and utterances of college presidents. The reasons are various and I shall not analyze them. I want rather to suggest a cure that we are working on at Princeton. It is an ambitious plan of a scope commensurate with the need for the development of the Humanities. It calls for new endowment of

about five million dollars. The proposal recognizes the importance of natural science and the social studies, and approves the strides which we have taken in these fields in the last few years. It recognizes that these subjects are indispensable parts of a liberal education, but it does point out that we have not succeeded so well in conveying the ultimate meaning of life to our students. Our purpose is to do more than we have been doing to see that we are not educating just fractional parts of a man. Atomized bits of knowledge are but a disconnected series of events until they are linked together in some universal meaning. For this link we must look to the Humanities.

The prescription is to strengthen the position of the Humanities in our educational process, and thus serve to rectify the imbalance of ideas that has been the theme of my earlier remarks. The solution is not more compulsory courses for all. We shall not achieve our aim through compulsion any more than the nation can build its faith by campaigns of national advertising or by starting a new foundation in education for democracy. Our only tools are the tried and true instruments of education, the church, the home and the school; and as a school Princeton is planning to do something about it.

The Humanities deal with the "first principles which lie deep in the heart of reality. The most important of them are truth, freedom, integrity, beauty, courage, justice, love and humility. These great moral, aesthetic and religious principles have created our culture, and owing to their universality, have formed the ultimate bases upon which our culture has been able to establish fruitful contacts with cultures other than our own. Our culture, in its heart of hearts, insists that, whatever may be the flux of time, these principles are eternal and unchanging." This public stand we propose to take against the relativism of human values is an act of sincere academic courage motivated by a grave concern over the inadequacies of modern liberal education.

We in education have been teaching a great deal about values but have neglected to teach the values themselves as the essence of human experience. This my colleagues propose to correct in a new cross-departmental program, impressing on the lives of our students the common factors underlying all fields of the Humanities. Its impact will not be limited to students participating directly in it; it will influence other courses and extend to the

whole life of the campus. It will treat the enduring values of classical literature and art which work towards "clarity, unity and universality in a world which is confused, divided and specialized." It will provide the best specific against the sickness of over-specialization. Its stress will be on the relevance to present needs of the great enduring truths that alone can tell us why we are here and where we are going. Teaching the Humanities more strongly as a living faith will impart to budding lawyers, doctors, scientists, engineers, architects and businessmen what they should know to be competent individuals as workers, citizens and people.

This sort of positive teaching is education for use. For art, literature, philosophy, music and religion cultivate creative imagination. A scientist or an engineer will be more creative in his own field by having his imagination stirred and his judgment strengthened by knowledge and appreciation of 'great thoughts expressed in literature, religion, art and philosophy.

In this day when there is so much preoccupation with social forces, the Humanities uphold the banner of personal excellence against the worship of mass organization. Truth and beauty do not bubble up from undifferentiated crowds. Crowds tend to organize around a low common denominator of security and self-interest. Yet it is love of truth and beauty that distinguishes man from even the highest animals; and it is truth and beauty that sustain personal excellence against the deadening levelling of the mass mind.

The end of liberal education is wisdom. What is wisdom? It is hard to define satisfactorily or even to specify what we mean by it, and I shall not attempt to do so now. Nevertheless, it has a meaning that we all grasp in a common manner and we do know it when we see it. Its foundation is not capacity to command our physical environment for economic ends. Rather does wisdom relate to ultimate satisfactions and how to achieve them. It arises from the union of all knowledge as a guide to the application of science and technology to the service of the human aspirations of the soul.

That a University should desire to teach wisdom as its end product may seem pretentious, but I hope that we in common with all other institutions of liberal learning will never be satisfied with anything less.

LANGUAGE STUDY AND WORLD AFFAIRS

EARL J. McGRATH

U. S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

IN a recent international meeting on education the delegate from Egypt rose and addressed the audience in faultless English. The next day with equal fluency and precision he used French, the other official conference language. In private conversation with the representative from Western Germany he spoke the latter's language. And, of course, he was master of Arabic, his own tongue. Though the educators from some 40 other nations were linguistically less versatile than he, most of them could use at least one tongue in addition to their own with ease and exactness.

At this conference the United States was represented by five persons, all of whom had no less than 19 years of formal schooling and all of whom held the Ph.D. degree. Yet no one of them could use another language well enough to carry on even a private conversation fluently, to say nothing of addressing the conference formally from the floor. This is not an unusual situation. Americans who travel in other lands are quickly impressed with the ability of other nationals to understand and to speak several languages. They are also keenly aware of and often embarrassed by their own inadequacies in this respect.

But many Americans faced with these facts, and unhappily even some who have had considerable schooling ask, "What difference does it make?" Another common response is, "If it is necessary for non-English speaking people to communicate with us, let 'em learn English." More chauvinistic persons even say, "If we are the most powerful Nation on earth, and destined for world leadership, then certainly English ought to become the common language of mankind—so why should we learn other languages?" A response once more reasonable, but one now based on a false premise is, "Well the Dutch, the French and other Europeans need to learn languages because they live so

NOTE: Delivered at the 35th Annual Meeting of the Central States Modern Language Teachers Association, Statler Hotel, St. Louis, Missouri, May 3, 1952.

near other countries with which they have close commercial, diplomatic and social relations. Likewise, the Egyptians and other Middle Easterners are at cultural and commercial crossroads of the world where the knowledge of several languages is indispensable. "But," so the argument runs, "with the exception of the few Americans whose positions in business or Government take them to other lands our citizens can get along with English. And even though this small group, and a few others whose professional activities require that they read foreign languages, would profit from language instruction, the American school system surely cannot be organized around their limited needs."

The most charitable offhand rejoinder one can make to such quick generalizations is that they stem from ignorance of the world position and responsibilities of the United States. Nevertheless these statements must be taken seriously, for in them the issues concerning the place of foreign languages in our schools today are to be found. How these issues are resolved is a matter of considerable significance not only in the affairs of the Nation, but in our own individual lives as well. Hence, the social, the political, the international reasons for the study of languages deserve the thoughtful consideration of all who determine the character of American education. There are, of course, other arguments for the study of languages. It has been contended, for example, that such study disciplines the mind, cultivates the more precise use of English, opens up the great literature of other nations and provides a tool useful in other intellectual pursuits. However great the merit of these various arguments, I wish now to avoid them, in order to focus attention on others which in my judgment are at this moment in our history of far greater importance to the American people.

For the average citizen the basic consideration in a discussion of language study today is our world position as a nation. Our leadership in the United Nations Organization, our efforts through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to join free nations in resisting totalitarian aggression, our intellectual and cultural activities in connection with UNESCO, our technical assistance under Point 4 and the Mutual Security Agency, our work in the Organization of American States, our Fulbright program for the exchange of teachers and students—all these activi-

ties and a host of others like them make our position of international responsibility and leadership abundantly clear. These international involvements, combined with the development of rapid telephone and radio communication and rapid transportation by air, now place us politically, physically and socially closer to the Egyptians than Frenchmen were to Norwegians only a few years ago. The activities of our national and personal lives affect, and are affected by, people in the far corners of the globe.

The point need not be labored. We are living in one world. This small world is one in which all of us—not only diplomats, businessmen and scholars—must live out our lives, and our children will live even more intimately than we with their contemporaries in other lands.

Whether we discharge our world responsibilities well or poorly, foolishly or wisely, ignorantly or understandingly, will be determined by our ability to understand other peoples and their ability to understand us. However valuable our military and foreign assistance programs may be, and I would be the first to attest their worth, our world position and the future of democracy in the decades ahead will not be determined by our military power, nor by our generous financial and economic assistance to other peoples. Some actually fear our power. Others fear dependency. Both these attitudes make difficult the achieving of affirmative mutual relationships. Our own long-term leadership must rest on firmer grounds than military and other forms of material assistance. The late Dr. Bennett, Director of the Point 4 program, once said that we could not succeed in uniting the free nations around the banner of democracy except as we can convince those who differ from us in culture, color and creed, that we understand and respect them.

One of the traditional arguments of the advocates of foreign language study is pertinent in this connection. Only through the ability to use another language even modestly can one really become conscious of the full meaning of being a member of another nationality or cultural group. It is in our national interest to give as many of our citizens as possible the opportunity to gain these cultural insights.

What then are the implications for American education? The

first is crystal clear. The educators from the elementary school to the top levels of the university system ought to give immediate attention to this matter. The basic cause of our inability to use foreign tongues is not hard to find. Educators who study school systems of other lands are impressed with the fact that in those countries the study of foreign languages is not delayed until the upper years of schooling. On the contrary, in many other parts of the world, second and even third languages are begun in the early grades. Comparisons with other nations can be instructive in this respect. In order to avoid differences in systems of grades or forms, ages will be used. In Sweden, for example, in one type of school English is begun at the age of eleven, German in the 13th year and French in the 14th; in France, a first foreign language in the 11th and a second in the 13th; in Italy, a first in the 12th; in Egypt, a first in the 9th year and in Lebanon in the 6th. Often in the latter country bilingualism begins even in the kindergarten. The advantages over our own opportunities for language study are obvious. I am aware that in most of these countries the system of education is more selective than in our own and that not all children receive language instruction at these early ages. As I shall show later, however, this difference does not invalidate my argument because I am not going to propose that *every* American child should be required to study a foreign language at an early age, or indeed at *any* age. The point I wish to establish now is that the citizens of other nations excel ours in using foreign languages, and the principal reason for this superiority is that they have the opportunity to study languages early in their lives in the school system.

It is harder to generalize about educational practices in the United States than in other lands because the control of educational policy and practice here is properly located in the several states and communities. Nevertheless it can be said that few elementary schools anywhere in this country offer instruction in foreign languages with the exception of the bilingual regions, as for example in Florida and the southwestern states where Spanish is spoken, and in Louisiana and Maine where French is commonly used. Hence only a small percentage of American children have an opportunity to begin the study or use of a language other than their own before they enter high school. Yet it is a

psychological fact that young children learn new languages easily and idiomatically. In learning to speak without accent they excel their parents because their speech habits are not rigidly formed. If, therefore, easy and natural communication is one of the principal aims of language instruction, there is good reason to begin the study of a new tongue at an early age. And there is no convincing evidence to show that under proper conditions the learning of another language interferes with the further refinement of one's own or causes other psychological disturbances. Moreover, the early beginning of a new language has the obvious advantage of affording a longer period of later schooling during which the child can perfect his speaking and reading habits. At present many youth begin the study of foreign language so late that with all their other academic obligations there is not time to gain an actual working facility in the new tongue. And there is the further advantage in an early start that those students who have real ability and interest in language study can undertake a second foreign language before the end of their formal schooling if they wish to do so. There is ample evidence to support the statement that a speaking knowledge of a foreign language is becoming increasingly useful in nearly all occupations and professions. But quite apart from any practical use which is made of the knowledge and regardless of whether a high degree of skill is developed or maintained, foreign language study extends the horizon and fosters desirable attitudes toward other peoples—an outcome which is highly important in our world today. It is clear, it seems to me, that these are cogent psychological, social, pedagogical and national reasons for intensifying and increasing the scope of language instruction in the American school system.

My first proposal then is that there be a complete reconsideration of the place of foreign language study in American elementary education. Such a reappraisal, I should hope, would lead to the offering of foreign language at least on an optional basis in many of our schools beginning in the fourth, fifth or sixth grades. To be sure, the present offerings of the elementary school are so demanding that educators are hard pressed to find time for all the activities that seem to be justifiable. Nevertheless, the prime purpose of the school is to prepare the young for the life of their time. I have attempted to show that many of

them must know the languages of other peoples who will live with them in this shrinking world. If this be true, then the curriculum of the elementary school must be so organized as to make a place for such instruction. If this were to be done within a decade, many of our youth would have a foundation in at least one foreign tongue.

I am under no illusions concerning the difficulties involved in such a proposal. In the first place, 22% of all public schools have fewer than six rooms. Organized language instruction will not be possible in many of these schools, but even among them a teacher will sometimes be found who can start a few pupils in a new language. In many larger schools, too, there will be a paucity of teachers with the necessary education in foreign languages. In time this difficulty should be alleviated through enlarged and improved opportunities for language study in the teacher-training institutions. In the meantime various temporary devices can be used such as making high school teachers available on a part-time basis, using graduate students part time in communities where colleges and universities exist and employing student teachers from nearby teacher training institutions. All these plans have been tried with success in some American cities.

In San Diego, for example, where 4th, 5th and 6th grade classes in 30 schools are studying Spanish, the program has progressed through carefully guided experimental steps toward an assured place in the curriculum. Because of the outstanding leadership of principals, central office staff and alert classroom teachers, city-wide foreign language offerings in the grades are possible in Los Angeles, Seattle and several places in Texas. I understand that 10 elementary schools in St. Louis provide foreign language instruction through the cooperation of part-time teachers from the high schools. Lawrence and other cities in Kansas are developing successful techniques with student teachers from the University of Kansas. In the District of Columbia, television programs in French and Spanish will soon supplement the regular instructional program. But whatever the plan of organization, results indicate that elementary school children really like to study a foreign language and can learn it easily. The parents are pleased too. In some communities, in fact, the parents and lay

public are ahead of the schools in their efforts to provide opportunities for foreign language experience in the grades.

Such practices can be adopted in hundreds of communities. There is no one perfect method for introducing language instruction in the elementary schools of the Nation. Each school system must of necessity be limited by the resources available, but much could be done at once in many places. It is this point that I wish to emphasize. I am not proposing that every child in every elementary school in every American community be required to begin the study of a foreign language. I am suggesting that as many American children as possible be given the opportunity to do so, and I believe that with a little ingenuity and determination this opportunity could be extended to hundreds of thousands.

Though some teachers of other subjects, some school administrators and some laymen have opposed such a proposal, I believe many are now ready for it. Where experiments have been tried, children and their parents have generally been enthusiastic about the early study of a foreign language. The world situation, I believe, is making our people generally conscious of the value of any type of instruction which will lead to greater understanding among peoples. If the study of languages can be made an integral part of a broader program of studies aimed at the objective of international understanding, I believe it will find a ready welcome and adequate support in many communities as it has already in some.

Greater emphasis should be given to language study in high schools and in colleges for the same reasons as apply to the elementary schools. It is particularly important that young people who have begun the study of a foreign language in the grades have the opportunity to continue their study through the secondary school and college years. If I have not treated extensively the place of language study in these institutions it is because, relatively, they are in a better position, and because the cause has many more advocates at the high school and college level. Nevertheless it must be admitted that enrolments in foreign languages have fallen relatively in both high schools and colleges in recent decades. Again in view of the world situation this decline has been unfortunate. I hope, and I believe if

proper steps are taken, these trends can be reversed. We cannot wait for a generation of elementary school graduates to swell the numbers of those who can command other languages because of high school and college study. Officers of Government charged with the recruitment of men and women to enter the diplomatic service and the various technical assistance programs, to take only two illustrations, are desperately conscious of the lack of qualified persons to undertake such assignments. Students in the upper levels of the school system whose interests incline them to this type of occupation, the qualifications for which are rapidly being clarified, should be encouraged to prepare themselves in the use of foreign tongues. But because of our past practices many such persons will have to prepare themselves quickly for foreign assignments by taking intensive full-time language instruction.

If I may say so in the most constructive and kindly spirit, our present inadequate supply of Americans who can speak, read and understand other languages has been caused in part by the language teachers themselves. To gain the popularity it deserves, language study must in my judgment be made more functional, if I may be permitted a single lapse into "pedaguese." From the elementary school through the college I believe the spoken language should be emphasized, and the many modern teaching methods and devices that have been so successfully employed put to maximum use. Moreover, unless language study is related to history, sociology, art, geography and the other aspects of life which make up the totality of a culture, it will remain at best only partly alive and it will not achieve the principal objective I now have in mind, namely, the preparation of our people for life in a world civilization which can be saved by only one means—understanding among peoples.

In the elementary schools this view implies that children while studying French, or Spanish, or German will at the same time be introduced at least at an elementary level to the many aspects of the daily lives of the people who use those languages. In the high schools and colleges, with increasing comprehensiveness and intensity of analysis as the upper levels of education are reached, I believe some form of area studies is desirable. Since I have developed rather fully the concept of area studies with language com-

ponents on several other occasions, I will not do so now. Suffice it to say here that a rounded program of this sort will vitalize all the disciplines contributing to it, including languages; and it will permit students to see broadly, critically and discerningly a culture other than their own. Let it be clear that I am not minimizing the study of the specialized technical branches of language, of interest primarily to certain types of students and future scholars. At the moment this is not my concern. But no proposal I am making, it seems to me, would interfere in any respect with the proper advancement of such studies.

Even though this discussion may be convincing, it may appear to some to be academic, leading to no precise action. On the contrary, this matter seems to me of sufficient importance to move me to propose that some organization, perhaps the Modern Language Association, take the leadership in bringing together a deliberative body to consider the status of foreign language study in our entire educational system with the special mission of considering the earlier study of foreign language by large numbers in the American schools. In this enterprise the Modern Language Association would doubtless wish to join its efforts with those of the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Association, an organization which has obvious contributions to make to such an endeavor. Without attempting to determine the types of representation in such a body, I would suggest that it include in addition to language teachers, representatives of the disciplines of history, sociology, anthropology, education and psychology. It should also include administrative and guidance officers since these groups can be very effective in setting policy and influencing the attitudes of students. Persons in several branches of Government, charged with the responsibility of finding personnel for overseas assignments, could well be included since they daily meet the vexing problem of recruiting persons skilled in the use of foreign tongues.

Such a group of persons chosen because of their vital interest in this matter could analyze the existing situation and make convincing proposals concerning the importance of language study in American life. It could also be influential with the members of the academic fraternity in the establishment of adequate language programs, and it could further sensitize the lay public to

the need for language instruction and enlist support for it. This is a matter which deserves the earnest consideration of all members of the academic profession and of all laymen as well. I return to the point I emphasized at the outset.

The United States is, whether we like it or not, in a position of world leadership. If it is to discharge its obligations wisely and well, our citizens must understand other peoples and other cultures. To gain such understanding many Americans must command a knowledge of one or more foreign languages. If they are to acquire these language skills our school system must provide opportunity beginning in the early grades for many children to study other tongues. It is in the national interest for members of the profession and laymen to unite their energies in an effort to increase foreign language study among our people. In doing this I firmly believe they will be making a vital contribution to the well-being of our people, to our national prosperity and to international understanding and peace.

WHAT DIFFERENCE WILL YOUR COLLEGE EDUCATION MAKE?

ORDWAY TEAD

CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION, NEW YORK CITY

THERE is probably nothing more paralyzing to the effective outlook of today's college graduate than the thought—usually unexpressed, but still influential—embodied in the familiar questions: "How can I have any worth-while influence? How can I *count* in helping to solve all these difficult public problems?"

I honor the honesty of these questions and I want to address myself today to them. For I believe that at the point of a realistic answer to these often anguished queries about one's personal effectiveness, we should be able to find this *difference* about being a college graduate to which my title refers.

I want to be quite concrete—in terms of the activities which all of you will be exposed to in the years immediately ahead. And my point is that there *are* channels as diverse as our individual interests and skills in which each of us can focus our interests, show our devotion and pour out our energies. My own experience, widely corroborated, is that if we individually will become clear as to what deeply interests us, and if in relation to such interests we will cultivate the skills necessary for performance in the directions indicated, the chances for involvement, the invitations to "join up," the opportunities offered for individual and for group contribution, will multiply with the years. You need not, I assure you, be worried that there will not be a chance to "do your stuff," or "to have an influence," or "to help shape opinion or policy," if, by lonely pioneering or in shared group efforts, you show that you know what you are about and will gladly take some self-assumed responsibility. College has made you *different* if you will say in the days ahead: "I don't know just what this task or opportunity may involve, but it looks important to me and I am eager to try."

For I can assure you that there are *more* important things to be done, more influences to exercise, more challenges to profes-

NOTE: Commencement address, Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Virginia, June 2, 1952.

sional or community leadership to be assumed than we ever find enough people, men or women, to undertake competently. In all these efforts you can count in the total constructive drive. Arnold Toynbee's idea of the "creative minority" and its efficacy in public services applies to you as you become oriented to the tasks of life.

Yet I have no sermon of unpleasant duties or obligations to burden you with. I have a brief and simple theme. It is that this college will have made for you this difference that it should, if you find you are, first, asking the right questions. And, second, that you are finding answers to those questions which enable you to say: "These new experiences are rewarding, productive and satisfying." I suggest that you go along with me in terms less of duties (which are real); and more in terms of deep personal realizations (which are also a fact). And I believe you will come to understand that duty and self-fulfillment are essentially the two sides of the same coin. They stand as the modern equivalent of the Socratic injunctions To Know Thyself and To Be Thyself. Oliver Wendell Holmes, the younger, said similarly, that "the law of duty and the rule of joy seem to me to be all one."

I shall allude to five areas of your probable experience in the years just ahead. They are work, family, community, international relations and your own aloneness. In respect to most if not all of these, all of you will inevitably find occasions in which *duty and deep satisfaction can be made to coincide*. That reality is, again, one great *difference* that college should make.

First as to work. Probably many of you will be in the labor market for the next two to five years. This is a privilege and not just a time-serving necessity. Yet it all depends upon how you approach the job—what your attitude is. If I may oversimplify the picture, there will be three possible approaches to work. Some of you may rebel—namely those who believe that our American system is not idealistic enough and who would like to keep away from materialistic ambitions. I suspect that any of you who may take this view are the artists of the class—painters, musicians, writers. I respect, though I do not share, such a reaction to the total scene. Indeed, there may be a few who politically are questioning the basic premises of our glorious

democratic faith and momentarily see validity in some extreme leftist dogma.

Or one may go to the other extreme and acquiesce complacently in every feature of our way of life—indeed, to the point of worshipping what William James has called “the bitch goddess, Success.” And one may strive to marry “well,” as we say, and occupy what is essentially a well-heeled if not actually a parasitic place in society—which is all too easy to do and is usually completely unrewarding in terms of growth and grace. You will be helped to this aim if you will study carefully the pages of *Vogue*, *Harper's Bazaar*, *Mademoiselle*, etc. which may now seem glamorous. But I do hope as you turn these pages you are not unconsciously saying, “I would rather be a clotheshorse in the resorts of the swagger than to dwell in the less pretentious tents of wisdom.”

The third option here is, of course, the one I believe in. It is to try to make the work experience you select as fully as possible your own channel of a distinctive creative effort, where you are at once making a contribution derived from your talents, and by so doing are enriching the productive life of society—in business, art, education, social work, at home, or in some other of a thousand outlets. Nor will this be as difficult as it may look in advance. The question is: Do you approach work as a necessary evil or as an opportunity for relating yourself organically to your fellows in a reciprocally responsible way?

Every position has its routines and its pedestrian moments. But your education should have made you *different* enough so that in work you are able to find a large measure of your salvation and sanity. Also, to share for a few years in the salaried work of the world will give you understanding and sympathy about the career difficulties and tensions of the young man you may marry. I hope you won't want to be a “corporation wife” in the sense that phrase has recently been used in *Fortune* magazine, where the contention is advanced that corporate heads are anxious that the wives of younger executives shall be socially regular, tractable and mentally inert, in the interest of the assured advancement of their husbands. But it is important that you be understanding as an active partner about the struggles and temptations, as well as the opportunities, which the young

men whom you know confront in the first dozen years of their business careers.

Second, I hope you have reached some awareness of the truth that many of the priceless civilizing and humanizing influences of our society get their first and best nurture in good family experience in our early years. Some of you are probably still in subtle resistance to parental influences, which may perhaps be normal. But, if college has made the *right difference*, you are hopefully beginning to realize that you can function happily, creatively and nobly as a self in and through the conduct of a home and the rearing of a family. Here again, the eager and constructive approach means everything to success. And that implies among other things that you marry for the right reasons. I sometimes feel that today there are too many to whom the saying may apply that they marry in haste and repent at leisure; or who say bluntly: "If this marriage does not work out, I can always change." I talked recently with an art teacher at New York University about the promise of a remarkable graduate now studying in Paris; and I said—"she has really great promise." And he replied, "It all depends on who she marries."

Similar tastes and interests, a real sense of companionship with equal respect and equal burden-bearing, a minimizing of money ambitions, forbearance for the frailties of one's mate, a common desire for a family—these are most needful. You don't marry, in that terrible phrase, to "settle down" or even to "settle up." There is no *settling* about the entire process. It is a dynamic tension of continuous human adjustment that requires all the intelligence and loving kindness you can bring to it. In short, try to find a man who is anxious to help you to be your own self at its best.

I am not placing in opposition the claims of a career and those of homemaking. Both can be combined. But during the children's younger years it is not easy to swing a career without unusual physical stamina. And the claims of home-building itself call upon all one's resources far beyond anything a course in home economics could ever suggest. Indeed, you will find you can draw upon almost everything you have studied here to make yours a better and a different home.

Once the personal adjustments of marriage have become somewhat stabilized, there is the third big *difference* the college brings,

deriving out of your home life. I refer to your trained realization that the individual home depends for its proper functioning on community relations and services for which you cannot escape some share of responsibility. One does not today raise her children by herself alone. The local community provisions for health, housing, education, leisure time, transportation, art, worship—all these will influence the quality of your family's existence and progress. And the mother today has to share the burden of assuring that all these services are well provided. I care not how large or how small the locality where you will be living, your involvement in its public affairs becomes essential to a high level of family felicity. This may well mean some degree of participation by you in local politics. And I hope you have already come to that *different* understanding of politics which says that politics is not the self-seeking efforts of ambitious men, but is the art of securing the attainable in those civic affairs which have to be coped with if the richness of local living is to be assured. The modern mother who is on her job is the custodian of the well-being of the children of her community—for the simple reason that in all these matters we are only saved together—saved by a shared effort of informed citizens.

And you should realize in this connection that your own leverage in attacking all these matters can often be more independent and more vigorous than that of your husband because he may for reasons of time and economic prudence of self-interest be reluctant to become too militant about running afoul of some of the so-called "sacred cows" of the community. For the fact is that any civic improvement is likely to step on somebody's toes, or is likely to increase the tax rate, or will disturb some vested property interest. You can't get civic change without civic courage.

In this connection, if the local agency through which you choose to advance some good cause is using you as a volunteer, try to insure that your volunteer labors are at a level which is worthy of your powers. I realize the need for a decent humility and modesty in such matters. But I also have observed the unproductiveness and frustrations of a college woman with an I.Q. of 130, addressing envelopes for the Parent-Teacher Association as her major civic role.

In the matter of world outlooks, it may well seem to you des-

perately hard to relate oneself to the sources of public influence. But even here I would stress the need and duty of your individual understanding, the need of your participation in voluntary agencies devoted to foreign policy enlightenment, and the need of registering your conviction about foreign policy with the appropriate legislative and executive bodies.

When Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr says: "We cannot morally live on an island of plenty and security, within an ocean of worldwide poverty and insecurity,"—do we know what he is talking about?

When Charles Malik, the distinguished Minister from Lebanon to the United States, says "in the minds of many people (in eastern countries) Communism means, rightly or wrongly, greater hope than any platform so far urged by the Western world," do we know what he is talking about? And know what further steps this situation may involve for the Western democracies?

Malik goes on:

The Western world underestimates the importance of its heritage if it conceives its message only in technical and economic terms. Peace is the fruit of a fundamental community of ideas, and the underdeveloped peoples will be better developed and elevated by making accessible to them in their own mother tongues the great classics of human thought and valuation, in East and West alike, than by any other method.

In addition to their development, the underdeveloped peoples require the hand of fellowship. There are three reasons for this. First, even if he has no material need whatsoever, man cannot be happy without participating in some universal fellowship. Second, these peoples have one hand of fellowship constantly extended to them, namely, the hand of Communism. Third, it can be shown that there will always be people who are relatively less developed. Therefore, the sense of injustice which overtakes these people when they compare themselves with others cannot be eradicated altogether. But man would put up with anything if only he knew that he belonged to a larger whole. Fellowship is the only adequate compensation for doom. . . . The challenge of the Western world is whether it can evolve such a genuine universal fellowship.*

It is not in place here to discuss how we Americans can help

* "Manifesto for the West," *The Commonwealth*, May 9, 1952, p. 113.

to evolve some vital reality which will be a "genuine universal fellowship." But if we are to have the patience and fortitude to deal with the other three-fifths of the world which is not Anglo-Saxon, we are all required to be aware of the poverty, landlordism and corruption in certain areas, the inevitable rising tide of nationalism in others, the hatred of any imperial and colonial pretensions in all the so-called backward lands. We have to make the supreme endeavor to be different enough to put ourselves in their places, and see life through the eyes of their experiences. And then we must act in the light of this new understanding.

This is not impossible; and it will be invaluable if college people are sufficiently *different* in their attitudes to support the efforts of press and diplomacy to work with and not against the rightful aspirations of bewildered and impoverished peoples to adjust their living to the radically altered, technological world into which they have now to move. Such volumes as the Gandhi "Autobiography," Paton's "Cry the Beloved Country," Taylor's "Richer by Asia," van der Post's "Venture to the Interior," Douglas' "Strange Lands and Friendly People,"—to name only a few—are excellent sources to help stretch one's mind, one's human sympathies, one's recognition of the cultural values of other lands and of other religions. If college graduates do not become more global in their historic perspective on nationalism, for example, where do we look for the needful support for supra-national governments and meliorative programs of economic assistance of all kinds?

In all such matters, the initiative has to be with the powerful. And America is powerful. I know this power of America has not been sought by us; but it has to be acknowledged. And in humility we have to seek the means of exerting power in brotherliness and not in arrogance or detachment. We have to distinguish the real power of righteousness from the selfish righteousness of power, as Justice Douglas has reminded us.

Indeed, the very overburdening size of this assignment and of the loving humility it should induce, leads me appropriately to my final thought. It is that there is no coping with the tensions and fears of our world without some deep awareness that our personal, moral effort is related to something beyond our-

selves and to larger purposes only dimly envisioned. The tradition of this land, "under God" as Lincoln reminded us, is one we are proud to share and would not escape. But this American tradition in its religious terms has always to be freshly seen and freshly said and freshly meant in relation to current needs.

Whether it be in the confronting of foreign affairs or in confronting the vicissitudes of life in one's own individual soul or in any area in between, the burden of mystery, of challenge, of ignorance and slowness of improvement—this is a grievous one we each have to bear.

If, as the poet Whittier said, we are faced with "the silence of eternity interpreted by love," there is much that every sensitive person can do to listen to that silence in the way in which the Quakers have taught us to do, and much also in the rational effort which people with trained minds have to make to understand how love is to be interpreted and applied in the day by day complexities of life—embodied, as love has to be, in policy and program.

It is not for all of us necessarily to become theologians. But the importance and the *difference* it can make, if we will face up to the reality of God and to the acceptance of a God-ordered world, can be profound.

All this is no retreat from reason; it is no desire to be "wafted to heaven on flowery beds of ease." Neither is it a surrender to the strong irrational forces within our natures. Rather, the roster of those who in recent years in all the scholarly disciplines, including emphatically the most eminent scientists, who have stood up to be counted as finding a theistic view of life the only coherent and defensible one—this roster and testimony are too impressive for college graduates to be able to ignore.

And the implications of an affirmative faith in the transcendent meaningfulness and purpose of life and in the world's essential orderliness and creative possibilities—these are both personal for our own souls' good, and social for our common salvation as members one of another. And the only way to discover these implications is by becoming convinced of the affirmative faith—through experience.

In whatever direction the basic questions about life are raised—at work, in the home, in the community, in world affairs—the

moral responsibility of each person, up to the full measure of her intellectual powers, is inescapable. It is, I believe, the kind of world in which the guidance of affairs by progressively more rational and more loving measures, is the only approach that makes any sense. And there is in the depth of our natures, strongly implanted there, the demand that life has to make sense and in terms which are at once to some degree humanly comprehensible, yet also divinely intended beyond our full knowledge.

The deepening of one's belief that "God moves in a mysterious way his wonders to perform" carries with it the realization that no wonders are performed if you and I do not in enlightened ways participate in bringing them to pass. It is that realization of the dependence of righteousness upon our effort which undergirds and justifies the whole educational process for each of us. We have to become more rationally competent as moral agents. And because this is true, education has to be an effort which continues throughout life in the inescapable requirement upon each of us to be guided by our minds and hearts through widened knowledge to deeper wisdom.

In conclusion, I have not hesitated to make clear that we are all children of a troubled time. But I have tried to point out that we can do something about the conditions we face. And that "something" relates, first, to capitalizing on the place in life in which we each find ourselves. And it relates to the obligation to achieve the full release of the creative talents we each possess as at once a duty and a joy.

The great imperative—to be intelligent, to be loving, to be reverent—this comes to coincide in some wonderful way with the divine mandate to learn the meaning of a Will of God. And to have begun to grasp the meaning of this imperative which is ours is to have had our college education make *all the difference in the world*.

WHY SUCH LACK OF GOOD WRITTEN ENGLISH AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS?

I. N. CARR

DEAN, CARSON-NEWMAN COLLEGE

THE result of an examination of several recent issues of college newspapers reveals the fact that even those students ordinarily expected to be among the best in written English are frightfully weak in spelling, punctuation and the organization of content. If reports gleaned from instructors are correct, one would also conclude that even the average college graduate has a chronic and widespread weakness in the use of his native tongue. This leads one to conclude that for some reason the course in freshman English does not accomplish the desired end. Present practice seems to emphasize the lack of satisfactory training since many of the larger universities and colleges have technical courses in English. Or this lack may be evidenced by a requirement of the beginner in business as he takes his training with the company, preliminary to beginning his actual work. Examples may be cited, such as: Engineering English, Scientific English or Business English. *Fortune Magazine*, November 1950, stated that "something is very wrong with the teaching of English when graduates so fail to grasp the fundamentals of good English that they feel they must learn a separate kind for everyday life—and a rather bob-tailed one at that." In a recent copy of *What the Colleges Are Doing* published by Ginn and Company the same idea was advanced.

There is something wrong. Explanations are varied and sometimes valid. Often classes are too large. In some cases the emphasis is on literature to the extent of diminishing the value of both spoken and written English. It seems to me that the great need is practice, practice, and then practice some more. This must be done under the direction and correction of a sympathetic teacher.

In my opinion students do not get enough practice in English classes. Instruction in the choice of words, their use and the development of the language does, in no sense, replace practice in using it. In some manner, therefore, the subject must be pre-

sented in such an effective way that the student can see and believe in its immediate benefits. In my opinion a sense of deep appreciation and feeling for literature is not acquired until and after the student has a fair knowledge and appreciation for the technical structure of the language, or possibly the two may be developed at the same time. Consequently, a student who does not know his freshman composition and types of literature, and has not at least a fair knowledge of words cannot enjoy courses in Shakespeare, Milton or major writers presented in period courses.

Writing is not a hit-and-miss technique. It is a specialized skill and the method by which it is acquired is "practice." Once acquired it disciplines thought and behavior. It enables a person to express community problems, ambitions and objectives through the columns of the press. This training cannot be given alone by English departments in colleges and secondary schools. There must be a correlation of effort in all departments. The demands of standard requirements must be equally as strong in other departments as those of the English department. Teachers throughout the college, university or high school system must place a premium on and require good English. Otherwise the student is likely to get an erroneous impression and come to believe that requirements in English are departmental and, therefore, of less importance in other departments.

Certain new factors perhaps have not been fully considered in connection with the training of large groups in our present-day institutions. I refer to what may be called mass education. The fact also that youngsters attend school often against their wishes presents a second very serious difficulty. As in the grades, so in the secondary school, the student likes or despises the subject on the basis of whether the teacher is liked or disliked. This is unfortunate to say the least, but every administrator knows that this is a tremendous factor. Much thought must be given to this problem. It cannot be solved wholly by a return to former methods. New methods, practical exercises, plans and objectives must come into the picture. If possible an interest—yes, a devoted interest must be developed. While I do not know all possible solutions, the situation is clear in my thinking. If writing is a skill, a behavior, a way of thinking, yes a self-discipline, what

can the teacher do to accomplish more effective teaching in our present-day situation? My answer is that it can best be accomplished, if the instructor is inspirational, through practice and more practice. The whole problem challenges the best thought and planning in the teaching profession.

One of the greatest needs is the art of writing research papers. The student, however, may not have been prepared to write such papers and must first be given basic training in constructing the paragraph and finally a brief paper. Most college students do have the experience of writing papers for research, reporting the fruits of their research based on the facilities of the college library. The undergraduate student should learn every detail of this type of writing, particularly if the graduate school is an objective. Once enrolled in the graduate school, the professor will not inquire as to whether the student is prepared to write research papers. The demand for that ability will be much more exacting on the graduate level. The essential element of taking notes in class, library and the laboratory becomes a much greater necessity on that higher level of education. If the student has not been trained to do this type of writing, assignment of a topic will ordinarily produce frustration. He may simply become very busy taking worthless notes, or copying passages from encyclopedias. And when the paper is completed, it may consist of compiled excerpts collected and poorly connected in an attempt to meet only the requirements of the "assigned student task." This spirit of approach is contrary to the desired attitude of growing and advancing students.

Courses in writing research papers are rare and when offered are usually elective courses. Theme writing depends largely on original and imaginative material. The research paper is different because it calls for the ability to select data, organize them, and compile, classify and record bibliography.

In order, therefore, to reach all students, some time must be spent on the fundamentals of writing this type of paper. May I list below a few of the fundamentals?

a. *Delimitation of Subject.* College students must learn that World War I or II is a subject far too comprehensive for a brief research paper. Scholars have spent many years writing the history of a single country in World War I. If it is to be of a research nature, the student must select only a tiny segment of

such a large subject. He might choose a subject like Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points, or The Question of French Security or The Recognition of Nationalities in the Versailles Treaty.

b. *Reading and Note-Taking.* Work should begin by reading material suggested or recommended. Good note-taking should be followed from the beginning. This can be done if the student has perfected a system. The best way yet devised is on cards. These should be carried around so the student can jot down quotations whenever they are found. We often find facts when we least expect them. After one has read considerably, the third step begins to be formulated in the student's thinking. In the process of note-taking, name of author, source of reference, name of publisher, date of publication, with all other pertinent information, should be taken at the time the reference is used. As this process continues, one is usually prepared to complete the framework for the paper. The beginner may attempt to use paper instead of cards and usually finds it difficult to classify materials.

c. *The Outline.* In this connection, the first big test of the undertaking comes. If the outline, which is the blueprint for the undertaking, does not take form, perhaps more reading should be completed and a second effort at an outline undertaken. Once the student has learned to work in this manner, research papers will be better and organization of content will be improved.

d. *Classifying Bibliography.* The final compilation of bibliography can easily be arranged and completed from one's notes.

How often students make errors in this connection!

Finally, papers should never be assigned simply to give the student work to do. They should have a purpose and should be seriously read and evaluated. The paper should eventually go back to the student if desired. They might be filed in the college library or in the teacher's office for future use as reference. Students would do a better grade of work if they knew that papers would be fairly graded and not discarded and a casual grade recorded.

The college student who really learns to delimit the subject, take notes properly, outline and write the paper according to a plan develops the ability to work independently. He learns to use a library and take notes intelligently. This is a wonderful accomplishment in the art of writing.

Reasons for lack of instruction in this field seem to be lack of time, interest and an unwillingness on the part of the instructor to give concentrated time to such student projects.

POTENTIALS FOR PROSPERITY IN WEST VIRGINIA

M. J. HORSCH

PRESIDENT, WEST VIRGINIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

A THOUSAND years ago there lived on the plains of New Mexico a thriving Indian nation, closely related to their famous Mexican neighbors. For a thousand years they had lived there, at peace with themselves and the nations around them. Theirs was a good life; theirs a great heritage.

Based upon a closely integrated family life, forty generations had built a societal history of continuous progress in fine living. They were rich in goods and rich in spirit. Their fields were fertile and green, and their handwork beautiful.

When the white man found them he marveled at their gardens and their fields. His world had nothing to compare with them. He was amazed at their artistry in fine metals, and beads, and pottery and textiles. Their architecture, too, was striking and beautiful, testifying to a surprising understanding of the building arts. It is doubtful that the world has ever known a generally richer civilization.

Those who know that part of New Mexico will understand that no combination of natural advantages—minerals, rainfall or forests—was responsible for the prosperity of these Indians. Their rainfall was scanty. They were largely surrounded by desert waste. Their metals came to them from the south by trade with other Indian nations.

How then, would we wonder, could such a civilization spring out of the New Mexico desert? Such history as we have indicates three interrelated causal factors:

1. A closely integrated family life which perpetuated the best in skills, and information and tradition.
2. A deep-seated belief in the dignity of work and the joy in achievement—and a universal acceptance of the responsibility of the individual for service to the society of which he was a part.
3. A profound sense of responsibility to posterity: to leave his part of the world better than he found it.

NOTE: Commencement Address at West Virginia Wesleyan College, January 27, 1952.

Without attempting to appraise the comparative importance of these three factors, I should like to pay particular attention to the third of them—the sense of responsibility to posterity. It was their belief that unless a man enriched the earth through his life upon it, he should never have been born; and that any generation which did not enrich the life of succeeding generations had lived futilely. The soil must be richer, its products of higher quality, the pottery must be stronger, the fabrics more serviceable and beautiful, the national treasury richer.

Had it not been for the coming of the white man, much of what is now New Mexico desert, would probably be the richest spot on earth. But the white man—the Spaniard—found these Indians, and having marveled at their gold and their gardens and fields, confiscated the wealth and annihilated its owners. Some of the Spaniards stayed to enjoy the fruits of the fine agriculture.

But the Spaniard was not a builder of the soil, he was not imbued with any sense of responsibility to succeeding generations. He was a *user*, with concern only for himself and the present. As a result, after 40 generations of verdancy, two generations of the sons of Spain returned the land to desert, and desert it remains to this day.

Point of view would probably play a major part in determining the moral of this story. There are those who would point out that these Indians should have used of their resourcefulness, and time, and wealth to forge weapons of defense with which they might have repelled the Spanish invader. I doubt that this be the moral; for as it is, these people enjoyed 1500 years of peace—85 times the period of our existence as a nation.

Had these Indians built themselves a military force, the likelihood that they could have remained at peace with their neighbors for 1500 years is denied by the whole of history. Their warlike relatives, far to the north, have no parallel history of prosperity and peace. No, the indications are that their destruction might have been hastened by such a course.

There are those, too, who would insist that this bit of history teaches primarily, that a closely-knit family life is the key to national and societal well-being. While this undoubtedly contributed to the situation which developed, we must observe that

the same type of family life failed to produce such a civilization in China, over more centuries than 15.

Few would deny the role played by the belief in the dignity of work and the individual's responsibility to society. These, too, were important factors in the creation of this splendid society.

It seems to me, however, that the constant rise in the quality of living of these basically simple people grew out of their sense of responsibility to posterity. And I would submit to your consideration the general thesis that, basically, the continuing rise in the quality of living of any people over 20, or 30, or 50 generations is dependent upon this same sense of responsibility to the future. Witness the effect of only two generations of occupation by the Spaniard, who was more concerned with immediate, maximum personal profit than with any sense of responsibility to posterity. It is conceivable that one generation of Spaniards reaped a richer harvest than a corresponding generation of Indians would have realized. But who among us would say that the area of New Mexico concerned is richer today because of the occupancy by the Spaniard, or even that the heirs and descendants of the Spaniard are today enjoying a finer life than they would, had their forebears and the ensuing generations possessed the same sense of responsibility to posterity which was the heritage of their Indian predecessors?

But as we look around us are we not compelled to admit that we are committed much more to the philosophy of the Spaniard than to that of those whose fertile lands once occupied the deserts of New Mexico? Witness the destruction of our forests through lumbering operations; witness the destruction of our soil through blind waste of fertility or through unwise mining methods. Witness our deliberate waste of millions of kilowatts of water power while we feverishly exhaust our fuel resources. Witness our regarding coal simply as a fuel, burning it in such a way as to waste its greatest values, and in so doing interfering with the beauty and general health of all that lives.

We seem in such a frantic rush to find every fragment of our resources, and to exhaust them as rapidly as we can. Tomorrow and those who must live their lives in it are of little concern to us in our race toward exhaustion. We don't seem to have improved materially upon the philosophy of the Spaniard. We

seem to have profited neither from his great failures, nor from the notable success of his predecessors. We, too, live as though only we—and today—and gold in hand—count.

We have seen that over the generations, this is short-sighted policy. Is it good current policy?

Let us first classify man's major industries under four general headings: the agricultural, the extractive, the manufacturing and the commercial.

Into these occupational areas fall more than 75% of the people of the civilized world.

What is the relative income-producing potential of these industries? Since the 1950 census is still in preparation, we shall use the 1940 census data. It is quite probable that the relative positions of these four industrial categories have changed little in the decade. Let us see what the facts are.

Measured in total net income per person employed, or per dollar of wages paid, the highest returns are found in commerce, with manufacturing running a respectable second. Well behind manufacturing comes agriculture; and trailing all of them come the extractive industries.

Yes, added to the fact that the extractive industries, alone, impoverish over the long view, leaving poverty and desolation, they also bring the most meager returns while they operate. You may examine the record for any state you choose, and without exception you will find that to the extent that a state manufactures and buys and sells, its income levels are high and its wealth index increases and that to the extent that a state engages in the extractive industries, be they concerned with oil, or coal, or the metals or lumber, the income levels are low and the wealth index continues forever downward.

West Virginia is a raw-materials producing state.

We produce more hardwoods than any other state east of the Mississippi. Yet we have not a single major furniture factory.

We are second among the eastern states in the production of tanned leather; yet we have not a major shoe or leather goods factory.

We produce more pulpwood than any other eastern state, but we produce not one sheet of finished paper.

We lead in the production of fine by-products coal, yet there is more West Virginia coal processed in the Pittsburgh

area, or the Cincinnati area, or even in Canada, than in West Virginia.

We could go on into the textiles, and plastics, and explosives, and paint, and insecticide, and pharmaceutical and publishing industries, and find much the same situation. We are basically exporters of raw materials and as are all exporters of raw materials (be they states, regions or nations) our income level is uncomfortably near the bottom—37th among the 48 states. And what is even more serious: unless we can somehow reverse the trend, we face nothing but an ever poorer future.

There are, then, three disadvantages to the extractive industries.

1. They are relatively unprofitable—they never provide high living standards for the people who engage in them.
2. They lead to poverty and desolation for the region in which they are pursued. Witness the worked-out metal mining regions of the west, and some of the worked-out coal regions of the east.
3. As practiced they take and waste raw materials which coming generations will need: for our great efforts seem to be directed toward removal and disposal, not maximum use.

Lest we be misunderstood as saying that we should not use these resources, may we emphasize that the questions we have raised center about:

1. Over-emphasis upon removal and sale rather than upon the fullest possible use and the conservation of the full potential of the raw materials for the benefit of man.
2. The advisability—as a matter of pure economics—of engaging primarily in the business of extraction.

Raw materials have no value in themselves. It is only through man's skill and labor that they attain their value. Without them, man cannot forge the components of his present life. Without raw materials, man cannot produce. They thus become the vehicle through which man is enabled to translate the labor of mind and muscle into the satisfaction of his wants. When we lose sight of this nature of raw materials, we discard a basic principle upon which man's progress has been based. Raw materials are not wealth, they are vehicles through which wealth may be realized. And that state and that nation which concerns itself

with their use rather than their extraction and sale is universally the wealthy nation or state.

But let us digress for a moment to raise one question concerning the moral implications involved in the production of raw materials. Our position must be either that all of the rich mineral deposits exist as a matter of pure chance, or we must believe that a wise Providence had some part in their occurrence. Christian philosophy denies the former. Theism, quite universally would lean toward the latter.

If, then, we accept the thesis that a wise Providence placed these materials in the earth for the use of man, it would be difficult to believe that they were intended to serve only one, or two, or three or even four of the thousands of generations of man. We must conclude that, fundamentally, these raw materials belong to all of the generations—as much to us as to any, but no more. This raises the question which I should like to pose, but no answer: If raw materials were intended to serve man in the broad, long-term sense, then do I ever have the right to destroy or waste them even though I own the property on which they are found? Do my moral rights of ownership include only the use of the raw materials found on property which I own, or do they include the right to waste and destroy, as well? The Indians of New Mexico, without the benefit of Christianity, never granted the right to waste or destroy.

So much for our digression into consideration of moral issues. Let us return to the fact that it is the use—the fabrication of raw materials—which produces both immediate and long-term prosperity. Basically, this is a matter of how we regard raw materials—as wealth, or as a vehicle to wealth. That state which processes, and fabricates and manufactures, really is selling the skill, and technical know-how, the brains, if you will, of its people; and any time a state or nation trades brains for raw materials, the heavy trade balance is found in favor of the brains.

This is pointedly illustrated by the fact that Switzerland and Finland are Europe's poorest nations in terms of raw materials resources, but enjoy the highest standard of living on the continent. And, interestingly enough, the nations with the richest natural resources are Europe's poorest nations. Switzerland and Finland import their raw materials and export their work-

manship and technical proficiency. The Balkans, on the other hand, export raw materials and import workmanship and technical proficiency. Switzerland and Finland radiate all of the indices of the good life, while the Balkans are Europe's poor relatives.

Are we to conclude, then, that to be blessed with an abundance of raw materials is to be regarded as a handicap? Would Switzerland and Finland be poor, too, if they abounded in natural resources? To the first question the answer would be a "no"; natural resources are not, *per se*, a handicap. The second question would probably be answered with a qualified "no."

There is the fact that poverty is often a stimulus to activity, that necessity is the mother of invention, that Switzerland and Finland, by their lack of natural wealth, may have been driven by the necessities of sheer survival to find a substitute. This of course is not to be discounted.

However, two other admittedly related yet different factors would appear to be more directly responsible for what happened in Switzerland and Finland. It is easy for those who find themselves blessed with an abundance of natural resources to come to regard them as wealth, and to fail to realize that man's processing activities are more wealth-producing than are the raw materials themselves. The farmer's greatest danger lies in his natural tendency to regard farming strictly in terms of his own farming experiences, blind to the vast opportunities that would be open to him were he to appraise his farm in terms of what it would more profitably produce. The greatest hazard of the teacher is the tendency to build a neat fence about the practices and techniques garnered from his own school experiences and from his first few years of teaching. In all walks of life, human beings are cursed with a refusal to reach beyond their established patterns. It is so easy to think as we have been thinking, and do as we have been doing. In this respect states and nations perform much as individuals.

The essential factor, however, is to be found in the fact that Finland and Switzerland, even though partially driven by necessity, came to realize that the world's greatest resource is to be found in the minds and hands and hearts of men and women. Out of this realization grew the two finest educational systems

which Europe can boast. In Switzerland and Finland every man and woman is part of the national wealth. Every potential doctor, and scientist, and engineer, and teacher, and craftsman, is sought out and nurtured as an essential cog in the national economy. No potential is disregarded.

In the Balkans, on the other hand, education has been limited. Educational facilities have been meager. Illiteracy has remained high. Higher education touches only a few—those who can afford it, rather than those who show the greatest promise.

What is true of the nations of Europe, is universally true—true of nations, of regions, of states. The most positive correlation with wealth is not found in natural resources but in the educational level of people. Without exception, the best educated nations and the states with the finest educational programs are the wealthy ones.

This has been a generally recognized fact for quite a number of years. There was some difference of opinion as to the direction of the cause-and-effect relationship, however. There were those on one hand who maintained that the wealth index followed the educational index. But there were also those who maintained that high educational levels were due to, and made possible by, a primary prosperity; that prosperity was the cause, and fine educational programs the effect.

More than eight years ago the U. S. Chamber of Commerce quietly set about to settle the argument, if argument it was. They sponsored a rather extensive research to determine the real direction of the cause-and-effect relationship between wealth and education.

Late in 1944 they published their findings in a Chamber booklet under the title "Education—An Investment." In this report they show that, invariably, high prosperity levels have followed educational awakening. Those states, and even those cities, with the finest educational programs are the wealthy ones; and the Chamber research definitely established education as the cause, and prosperity as the effect. The relationship is a direct one; the direction universally the same.

The part played by education in the elevation of regional prosperity is three-fold:

First, it builds a sensitivity to the importance of conservation

and fullest use of all resources. In the second place, and more important, it produces the universal realization that it is in processing that the real prosperity potential is to be found. And finally, and most important, education produces the skills, and understanding, and technical proficiency to most effectively convert the raw materials into the goods which people need and want.

Most of us who are gathered here on this occasion are citizens of West Virginia. West Virginia is blessed with a combination of resources unequalled by any other state—coal, ceramic clays, cellulose, plentiful power, abundant water, a strategic location with reference to markets, abundant transportation. And yet we stand 37th among the states in gross per capita income. Even though we did not know that we stand 36th educationally, the evidence to be found in state and nation the world over should provide us with the reason for our low position, and point the way to a better day tomorrow.

Yes, rich as we are in natural resources, we are neglecting our greatest resource—the minds and hands and hearts of people. All the evidence which can be amassed, emphasizes the fact that not until we determine to recognize this can we hope to materially improve our position. Until then we can look forward only to becoming poorer and poorer as the years and generations pass.

And as long as we are spending nearly twice as much for alcoholic beverages alone as for all of education, let us not take refuge behind the perpetual question, "Where will we get the money?"

Education is an investment—the best investment, the most profitable investment the civilized world knows. Those nations and those states which have recognized this, and no longer regard it as a cost, are occupying positions of envied prosperity. Those states and nations who would join them will find no other formula. As West Virginians may we all hope that, as a state, we too, may discover the formula, and may we discharge our individual responsibilities in hastening its discovery. When we have discovered it, a prosperous, thriving, statewide industry, utilizing our rich resources, will replace our mad scramble to remove and export our resources. And many generations of West Virginians to come, will enjoy the fruits of our wisdom.

DEVELOPMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN PAKISTAN

WALTER CROSBY EELLS

FORMER ADVISER ON HIGHER EDUCATION IN JAPAN

IN spite of numerous and serious handicaps, higher education in the new country of Pakistan, sixth nation in population in the world (China first, followed by India, USSR, USA, Japan), is rapidly recovering from the colossal shifts of population and extensive bloodshed which unfortunately characterized "Partition" five years ago. In particular, comprehensive plans have been adopted and in part implemented for significant improvements in university and other higher education during the six-year period 1951-57.

At the time of Partition, which resulted in the organization of Pakistan as the world's largest Moslem nation, only three of the 21 major universities of the Indian sub-continent were in the territory allocated to Pakistan: these were Dacca University in East Pakistan, and the University of the Punjab and Sind University in West Pakistan.

East and West Pakistan are separated by a distance of about 1100 miles. The Eastern section comprises only one-seventh of the area of the country, but it has considerably over half of the population. Thus Dacca University (founded 1921) suddenly found itself the only university for a population of 42,000,000 people. At once, in addition to its instructional and research functions, it had to take on, with greatly depleted staff, the responsibilities of an examining and degree-granting university for the 47 colleges of East Bengal which formerly had been affiliated for this purpose with the University of Calcutta in present India.

The University of the Punjab at Lahore, largest city and educational and cultural center of West Pakistan, was the oldest (1882) of the universities of the country and had the highest reputation for scholarship. It acted as the affiliating university for 36 colleges with a total enrolment of approximately 60,000 students.

The other Pakistani university was University of Sind*, established at Karachi in early 1947 a few months before Partition, but moved to Hyderabad the capital of Sind Province, when a section of that province which included Karachi was cut off to form the new Federal District for the capital of the country. It was founded as an examining and affiliating university only, for thirteen colleges in the area, but now plans to establish teaching and research departments in a number of subjects.

Peshawar University was established at Peshawar, the capital of the North-West Frontier Province, in 1950. It is to be a teaching, residential and affiliating university. It plans to establish a number of teaching and research departments and a College of Engineering.

The fifth university, the youngest in Pakistan, is Karachi University, officially established in 1951 at the nation's capital, but still very much in the process of initial development, with a vice-chancellor but no faculty as yet. It is planned to develop it into a unitary residential university with all the colleges in Karachi, now eleven in number, as constituent units and with a number of residence halls under its direct control for graduate students. For this purpose it has secured a site of 405 acres on the outskirts of the city. It is expected that most if not all of the constituent colleges will move to this site during the next decade. A large stadium will be built adjacent to this site which the university may use when needed. Undergraduate teaching will be done in the constituent colleges but all post-graduate teaching and research will be organized and conducted by the university itself.

At the time of Partition the three universities and many of the 127 colleges suffered severely not only from the forced exodus of many faculty members but also from deterioration of plant and equipment since many of them were closed during that hectic period and used temporarily as refugee centers. Most of the distinguished professors of the three universities were non-Moslems and fled to India during the hurried and frantic exchange of millions of Moslems and non-Moslems across the boundaries.

* When traveling around the world with the "Town Meeting of the Air" in the summer of 1949 the editor had the honor of addressing a convocation at this University and was deeply impressed with its progress, vigor and ambitious program.

Thus at the University of the Punjab, for example, Dr. Bashir Ahmed (a Ph.D in Chemistry from Johns Hopkins University), Dean of the University, told the writer that 135 of the 150 faculty members fled to India; in the Department of Chemistry, for which he was particularly responsible, 16 of the 17 members of the staff left. Conditions were almost as bad in the other universities and many of the colleges. It has not been easy to fill such a large proportion of vacancies with qualified men. Dacca University, for example, today is asking UNESCO to assist it in securing professors and readers in English, Islamic history and culture, economics, international relations, commerce, physics, botany, geology, soil science, geography and ancient history.

At the same time, the universities and colleges, and especially the University of the Punjab with its superior reputation, were swamped with hundreds and thousands of Moslem students who sought to enroll themselves afresh as college or university students in Pakistani institutions suffering from insufficient teachers, books, equipment and supplies. Inevitably standards deteriorated and only now are commencing to be restored to something approximating their pre-Partition level.

The West Punjab lost three-quarters of its nurses at Partition and about the same proportion of doctors and dentists. Medical and dental colleges and schools of nursing have had to be reorganized and largely restaffed.

Educational leaders of the country accepted the challenge of the new and in many respects discouraging situation with a courage, a vision and a zeal that cannot but stir admiration. Pakistan became an independent state August 14, 1947. In November of the same year an educational conference was held at Karachi to discuss the more pressing basic educational needs of the country. This conference decided, among other things, that primary education should be carried on in the mother tongue, which is Bengali in East Pakistan, Pushtu, Sindhi and Urdu, with several minor ones, in West Pakistan. English instead of being compulsory in the sixth school year, as at present, hereafter will be optional. Thus by 1955 some of the students entering the universities will have no knowledge of English. By that date it is hoped that adequate textbooks may be provided to enable Urdu to become the universal language of instruction in-

stead of the present English. Whether this complete change is desirable or can be achieved by that date is questioned by many Pakistani educators.

More important from the university standpoint, however, was the conference of educational leaders held in Karachi in July 1951. This conference consisted of ministers of education from the different provinces, vice-chancellors of universities and directors of public instruction. They decided that the Educational Division of the Central Government should draw up a "comprehensive and integrated six-year development plan based on practical and realisable targets in the various fields of education." The plan thus developed was divided into two stages covering the first two years, 1951-53, and the next four years, 1953-57. With few changes it has been accepted as the working plan for the educational development of the country.

This excellent and carefully formulated plan covers pre-primary education, primary education, secondary education, schools for the handicapped, teacher training institutions, inspectorial staff, higher education (colleges and universities), adult education, audio-visual aids, athletics and physical education, youth movement, medical inspection, refresher courses for teachers, overseas scholarships, technical education, commercial education, etc. There is room in this brief article to touch upon only those phases of the plan which concern higher education.

The Advisory Board on Education and the Inter-University Board have agreed that the existing system of education is to be rearranged with a five-year primary, six-year secondary, and three-year undergraduate university, plus post-graduate universities. Because of its haphazard growth the existing system is lopsided and suffers from various deficiencies both in amount and in type, according to these educational leaders. Technical and commercial education have been isolated from academic education and too much neglected. As to university education, there is widespread dissatisfaction with its quality and character. It is designed too much to prepare young men for positions in government service, even though there is a surplus of men in such positions now, and too little to prepare them for constructive service in the industrial, commercial and agricultural areas where trained leadership is so badly needed, particularly since in the

past so many positions in these fields were filled by non-Moslems who no longer are in the country.

For the establishment of needed new schools and departments, and for strengthening the existing ones both in equipment and personnel, the six-year plan calls for the following expenditures in rupees for each of the five universities for the entire period 1951-1957. (Three Pakistani rupees equal one dollar.)

<i>University</i>	<i>Recurring</i>	<i>Non-Recurring</i>	<i>Total</i>
Karachi	11,908,638	55,258,300	67,166,938
Sind	6,956,168	22,267,050	29,223,218
Punjab	6,982,044	20,756,374	27,738,418
Dacca	4,620,230	12,728,750	17,348,980
Peshawar	2,734,201	9,836,000	12,570,201
Totals	33,201,281	120,846,474	154,047,755

The total of 154,047,755 rupees is equivalent to about \$51,500,000.

Pakistan has a total of 127 colleges. Of these 36 are intermediate colleges roughly equivalent to American junior colleges, 82 are degree colleges, and 9 are postgraduate colleges. This number includes 19 colleges for women. Total enrolment is reported as 29,393 (men, 27,502; women, 1,891). Although there are some colleges where students of both sexes study together, the special social conditions in a Moslem country require for sometime yet separate colleges for women. Privately controlled colleges have made an important contribution to higher education, but most of them find themselves in serious financial difficulties and rely too heavily on grants from the government. It is proposed to establish four new intermediate colleges (1 for women), six degree colleges (3 for women), and 10 hostels (3 for women). Total expenditures for these and other improvements for the colleges amount to 40,085,856 rupees, of which only 8,206,671 rupees is recurring, the remainder being for capital improvements.

In addition to these general colleges it is proposed to establish a College of Domestic and Social Sciences for Women at Lahore, and a College for Domestic Science and Arts at Karachi to accommodate 250 girls. The cornerstone for the latter was laid by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt in March 1952 on the occasion of her visit to Pakistan. The cost of these two institutions is placed at 5,049,740 rupees of which 1,392,500 rupees is recurring.

For training primary school teachers it is proposed to increase the 125 existing institutions to 226; and the institutions for training secondary school teachers from 11 to 37. It is estimated that these institutions by 1957 will provide 70,000 trained primary school teachers and 10,000 trained for teaching in secondary schools. Total cost of new institutions and improvements to existing ones is 54,496,316 rupees, of which 28,754,016 is recurring.

It is proposed also to establish 261 centers for giving refresher courses for present teachers, of three months each, which will train approximately 30,000 teachers, both men and women. An attempt will be made in these centers to bring the knowledge of present teachers up to date in various fields of study, acquaint them with new teaching techniques especially audio-visual aids and give them an appreciation of the fundamental principles of Islamic ideology.

It is also proposed to institute 372 scholarships for overseas students in natural and social sciences, the humanities, technology and education at a total cost of 5,503,000 rupees. These scholarships are designed primarily for staffing the universities and colleges. They are intended for fresh, talented, university graduates who upon completion of their studies overseas will take up teaching positions in Pakistani universities and colleges.

There are, however, a large number of teachers and administrators in service now in universities, colleges, schools and Education Departments who are in need of improving their qualifications and experience. It is planned in the six years to send 264 of these persons abroad for study at a cost of 1,962,500 rupees.

The total costs of the comprehensive plan (including many phases of it not directly concerned with higher education) is 1,150,380,069 rupees (\$383,460,023), of which 427,982,914 rupees (\$142,660,971) is non-recurring. Annual recurring amounts at the end of 1957 are estimated at approximately 170,000,000 rupees (\$57,000,000).

Such costs call for a considerable drain on the resources of a new country struggling for a balanced budget. The bulk of the cost must come from the national treasury although it is hoped to supplement it from other sources. Under the Colombo Plan a general six-year development plan for Pakistan has been ap-

proved which includes substantial amounts for education. Financial aid is also expected under the British Commonwealth Technical Assistance Scheme and the American Point Four Program.*

This is not only a boldly conceived and comprehensive plan. It is more than a mere plan on paper. It is actually working, approximately according to schedule. Appropriations needed for the first two years have for the most part already been made and the organization and advances called for are under way. After two weeks of conferences with educational leaders in Pakistan, the writer is conservatively enthusiastic over plans and achievements to date. Pakistan still has far to go before achieving its goals in higher education, but it is heading in the right direction and has already made remarkable progress during the short period of its existence as a separate nation. It needs, however, the sympathetic understanding and the active assistance of university leaders in the United States.

* The Ford Foundation has granted \$1,100,000 to the Government of Pakistan to assist in establishing a polytechnic training institute and an associated training center in general engineering trades, and two short-term industrial training centers.

GENERAL EDUCATION AND COUNSELING

PAUL L. DRESSEL

DIRECTOR OF COUNSELING, MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE

IN the fall of 1944, Michigan State College initiated a program of general education administered through a new unit called the Basic College. Although we are primarily concerned here with those features which are particularly related to assisting the students in the rational choice of a major, a brief resumé of the broader features of the program is necessary for complete understanding of the greater flexibility permitted the student in reaching a final decision.

The Basic College is made up of eight departments, seven of which are instructional and the eighth being assigned responsibilities for research and evaluation. Each of the seven instructional departments offers a three-term general education course. The courses are:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Written and Spoken English | |
| 2. Biological Science | 3. Physical Science |
| 4. Social Science | 5. Effective Living |
| 6. History of Civilization | 7. Literature and Fine Arts |

Every student who is a degree candidate is required to take the first of these, one of each of the following pairs, and one of the remaining three to make a total of five courses. These courses account for approximately 25% of the degree credit requirement. To some extent the choice of the pairs is specified by the student's intended major but in many cases the choice is made by the student with advice from his adviser or counselor. At the present time a reorganization is under way so that by Fall of 1953 there will be only four general education courses—communications, science, social science, and humanities—and these will be required of all students. The total general education credit requirement will remain unchanged. The immediate effect of this general education requirement is that

1. it provides an orientation to the broad areas of knowledge,
2. there is a common core of courses acceptable in almost any major.

The orientation provided by the courses is in itself an aid to

many students in choosing a major because it opens up to them possibilities not previously visualized. The general education requirement, amounting to about 50% of the freshman and sophomore years, insures that changes of major during this period will not be accompanied by as heavy a credit loss as would otherwise be the case.

An entering freshman is admitted to the Basic College and he *may* indicate a preference for engineering, agriculture or any other school or departmental major. If such preference is indicated the student is dually enrolled. He is advised by a staff member from the area of his chosen major and while working on his general education courses he simultaneously begins work on the introductory or required courses for his intended major. A student who is uncertain about a major may elect to enroll as a no-preference student. In this case the student utilizes the early part of his college program in an exploratory manner to assist him in an early choice of major.

An important characteristic of the two-year Basic College period is the ease with which changes of preference can be executed by the student. Recognizing the difficulty faced by a professor in a specialized field who tries to maintain objectivity while advising a student on continuance or discontinuance of a major in that field, and the hesitancy of a student in voicing to such a person his doubts about that field as a major, a change of preference during the Basic College period is executed through recommendation of a counselor and approval of the Basic College dean without requiring any approval or even contact with the major field adviser. This provision, coupled with the almost negligible loss of credit during the first year due to the universally acceptable general education courses, has been found to encourage greatly the reconsideration by students of their initial choices.

It was recognized that it would be unwise to allow students to change preferences on a momentary urge. Hence, coincidental with the establishment of the Basic College and the institution of these policies, a Counseling Center was organized. This Center, staffed by a group of professional full-time counselors with extensive psychometric assistance, was assigned the responsibility of approving any preference change requested by a student.

This approval by a counselor is in the form of a recommendation to the Basic College dean, but in practice, is always approved by the dean. The counseling staff was also assigned the responsibility of assisting the no-preference group of students in enrolment so that the exploratory programs of these students assume a planned character rather than a random choice which might otherwise result. Most of the no-preference students have sought extensive testing and counseling as a supplement to this exploratory program.

Many students who make an initial preference choice change after a quarter or two to no preference as an intermediate planning stage before selecting another major. This intermediate step is not required, however, and it is quite common for a student with a definite choice to seek extensive counseling and as a result to transfer directly to another preference.

When the no-preference enrolment was inaugurated no one expected that more than one to two per cent of the entering freshmen would select this possibility. Indeed, this was the experience during the first few years, but soon this per cent began to mount year by year until it reached 10% to 15% and promises to go even higher. This group of incoming freshmen augmented by no-preference students carried over from the previous year and by students switching to no preference after experiencing dissatisfaction with an initial choice has resulted in anywhere from 15% to 20% of the Basic College enrolment being in the no-preference category. The contrast between the expected 100 or 150 students and the actual 1000 to 1500 was a startling one—particularly to the staff of a dozen or so counselors charged with working with the group. A responsibility originally regarded as a minor though important one threatened to overshadow all other responsibilities. Obviously it was a situation demanding some study.

The reasons for this increase were not difficult to find. Perhaps the most potent factor was that as high school principals and counselors became aware of the no-preference possibility and the counseling facilities available to these students, they increasingly advised students who exhibited any doubt about a college major to avail themselves of this feature of the admissions program. Likewise, many parents were intrigued by the possibility

and similarly advised their sons and daughters. College admissions people also found the no-preference suggestion an easy solution to suggest to the student who wavered between two or more possible preferences. Still another consideration was found in the fact that to many students the choice of a major appears as a momentous decision and one to be postponed until certainty is achieved. Finally, it was found that students with deficiencies for particular majors accounted for a considerable portion of the no-preference group. For example, a student deficient in the mathematics required for engineering could utilize the no-preference enrolment as a means to removal of the deficiency prior to acceptance in engineering. Quite apparently, not all of this no-preference group was no preference in the sense originally intended. The deficiency group was easily accommodated by a change of policy which assigned them to their preference and permitted deficiency removal concurrent with that enrolment.

Faced with the fact that a limited counseling staff could not give adequate individual attention to the large remaining no-preference group—particularly when the counselors also had to deal with a wide variety of other student problems—consideration was given to alternatives that might reduce the load. It was felt that with adequate counseling many of the no-preference group might quickly arrive at a definite decision, but a brief Orientation Week involving 3000 to 4000 new students offers little opportunity for such intensive counseling. An extensive summer program provided the obvious alternative.

Accordingly, a summer program of "counseling clinics" was initiated. These were at first called to the attention of all admissions indicating "no preference" on their application blank, and later—because of the interest shown—to all students whose admission was approved. These clinics were at first few in number and each of only two days' duration but presently involve 10 or 12 three-day programs. In the summer of 1951 over 700 prospective students came in to the campus for three days, during which they took interest and aptitude tests, met administrative officers and professors in their fields of interest and received extensive counseling. The students were housed in residence halls and experienced an orientation to college about which they have been uniformly enthusiastic. Further expansion of the

program is in prospect, and awaits only the solution of the problem of providing adequate counseling staff during the period in which many of the regular staff must be on vacation.

The effect of this program, insofar as reducing the number of no-preference students has not been quite what was expected. To be sure, many students who designated a no-preference choice have, through this experience, made a definite—and our experience indicates—a satisfactory choice of major. Other no-preference students who did not reach that stage were at least enabled to lay plans for an exploratory program which promises an earlier decision than might otherwise be the case. However, many students who have indicated a definite major find that the clinic experience raises doubts to the point where they change to no preference. The immediate result is that the no-preference group is not reduced but may even be slightly increased.

On the long term basis, this initial increase may actually result in a decrease by eliminating many of the changes by second and third term freshmen or even sophomores to no preference. Certainly, the earlier the doubts are realized and resolved, the more advantageous it is for the student and, indeed, for the college since irregular programs are always a source of difficulty. This is currently being studied in a doctoral dissertation.

In general, the experience with the counseling clinics and preference changes generally indicates that many supposedly rational choices of majors are based on whims, suggestions of parents or friends and occasionally on very illogical premises. Under a more rigid program many of these individuals would continue in such choices until poor grades or general dissatisfaction resulted in dropping from school. Others with more determination might continue to a degree and endure for varying periods and with little satisfaction the occupation for which they were thereby prepared. It would be naive to assume that the M.S.C. general education and counseling programs have solved this problem, but both subjective judgments and such data as is available suggest that substantial progress has been made.

THE KNACK FOR SUCCESS IN CONTINUOUS FUND RAISING

PAUL H. DAVIS

THE basic reasons for success or failure in continuous fund raising are illusive; searching for them is almost as difficult as searching for the essentials of human happiness—and the answers given are as controversial. But there are basic reasons and hence there is a constant search to find them. In this search trustees of colleges and universities often ask questions like these:

Why is it universities and colleges who retain professional consultants are so often lucky in their fund raising? The fund raising methods they use seem to be simple, and although I hear considerable grumbling and complaining, yet I notice their annual total of gifts, grants, bequests and expectancies, is high, both when compared with their own previous records and when compared with other institutions. What's the knack for their success, and also why do they grumble?

When answering these questions there is a temptation to claim that the high results are due to the special services or the secret techniques of the consultants. However, in frankness, we consultants must admit that in major part it is due to just two factors: the knack of getting a large number of volunteers to participate effectively, and a policy of administrative decentralization. It's just that simple and because it's simple consultants often have difficulty in having it accepted. However, simple procedures, such for example as the Biblical one of "love your neighbor as yourself," often are not easy to accomplish. Therefore, it's not surprising that in continuous fund raising there are problems and that there are grumbles.

The reasons for the grumbles are quite as simple as the process itself. It is normal resistance to change. We all recognize that we human beings resist change, and many of us believe this is particularly true for faculties of colleges and universities,—this

NOTE: Paul H. Davis is a consultant in public relations and institutional finance. He has served as Vice President in charge of development at Columbia University, General Secretary of Stanford University and Manager of San Francisco Community Chest. This article is one of a series on the subject.

in spite of the reports of extreme liberalism on the campuses. So when the continuous fund raiser arrives on the campus he usually is met with a warning admonition like this:

Show us the techniques of fund raising but don't try to change us. We'll agree to there being a large number of volunteers, but let's have it clear right from the start that the volunteers are to go forth and raise the money, and we will do the spending.

Well, now, as human beings are constituted, the volunteers just aren't sufficiently noble to volunteer to go forth, raise the money and then step aside for others to do the spending—not on a continuous basis. In fund raising campaigns that sequence is possible by various pressure and competitive techniques but for continuous fund raising it just won't work. The volunteer who continuously can raise money isn't one so meek that he with no strings is going to hand over the results of his work to the faculty, or to the trustees or to anyone else. Such a volunteer requires that he be a participant all the way through and less status than that won't be accepted. This has been true of all of the volunteer programs where men serve year after year with tenacious faithfulness, as, for example, they do at Harvard, Princeton, Knox and now also at Columbia. These volunteers to be retained should be brought inside so that they are not just outside solicitors but so that they are actual participants in the college or university itself. And how to achieve that status for the volunteer is a bit of a knack for it has hazards in that lay volunteers must not be assigned academic authorities which they neither have the experience nor the knowledge to handle. The knack is to put them in a midway position where they can be effective, comfortable, important but where they will not be making any injurious academic decisions.

The second item for success is administrative decentralization. Economist Peter F. Drucker reports that one of the most important developments in the United States of the last fifty years is the continued decentralization of power, but the decentralization of which Mr. Drucker speaks has been more evident in industry than on the campuses or in government. On the campuses the first response to a recommendation for decentralization is: "All right, we'll do that." But again we run against human nature.

Does anyone cheerfully, willingly give up power? It seems human beings just aren't constituted that way. And although the central administrative offices will quickly agree to decentralizing fund raising that is followed with the admonition:

Decentralize the money raising function to our departments and schools but of course the control of how the money is to be spent must remain in the central office,—otherwise everyone would just run rampant.

And so again there's a clash, for on a continuous basis the departmental administrative faculty won't give the necessary time and effort in enlisting, in organizing and servicing volunteers for fund raising, taking precious time away from their academic duties unless they can have an important voice in how the resultant money is to be spent.

Harvard University was the first to recognize this fundamental, even glorifying it with a slogan of "every tub must stand on its own bottom." And any unit at Harvard that does its own fund raising enjoys a major voice in how the money is spent. The Harvard Graduate School of Business, under Dean Donald Kirk David, is a prime example of this policy in action.

Columbia University, after the passing of President Nicholas M. Butler, quickly agreed on a decentralization policy but then fought it with the full rugged strength of its 296 years of being buttressed in the granite rock of Manhattan, but finally even mighty Columbia accepted the principle. Now Columbia boasts of its decentralization for recently General William J. Donovan publicly proclaimed—

Columbia's decentralized development is a marked success with the dollar volume of gifts—\$5,903,000—the second highest recorded in the University's history.

Columbia Teachers College, under the enlightened administration of President William F. Russell, early adopted the principle of decentralization and therefore is admitting volunteers with amazing ease. As a result their total of gifts, grants and bequests has spurted upward and they have not only passed the previous records but in some quarters it is claimed that their total is greater than the combined total of all other teachers colleges in America. Be that as it may, it's a healthy-looking uptrend that President Russell annually reports to their faculty.

Some administrators of universities at first protest, "We're too large for decentralization." The answer to such assertion is, "Look at Harvard." Administrators of small colleges say, "That's all right for the big universities but we're too small for such a system." Then the reply is, "Look at Knox College in Central Illinois, where President Sharvy G. Umbeck has decentralized so much responsibility and authority that some people even wonder why they need a president." Their current record of gifts, grants, bequests and expectancies achieved by volunteers who are loyally and effectively participating looks most promising for the continued success and future of Knox College. At that campus there isn't the faintest echo of the currently popular apprehension that the small independent Liberal Arts College can't survive under the present competition in philanthropy.

No, it isn't just a question of big or small, or of urban or rural either. Look, for example, at Stanford in the West. Stanford is located some 33 miles south of San Francisco and is in the midst of 8,000 farm acres—yet the method has been successful there. Nor is it even a question of independent institution versus state institution. President Gordon Gray at the University of North Carolina already has hundreds of volunteers working in development, public relations and fund raising programs, and the volunteers there are launching one of the most ambitious plans in the United States under the title of "The Mission of the University of North Carolina." Those interested might well send to President Gray for a copy of that mission. If the program is successful the accomplishment of it may prove to be one of the major forward steps of this generation in higher education—at least in the developmental aspects. President Gray's ambition not only extends to volunteer fund raising for his university but extends to all higher education in the state, and many predict that he's going to succeed in this bold undertaking.

The answer to the basic search for the fundamentals of fund raising success is that any college or university whose objectives are meritorious can succeed in continuous volunteer fund raising if they will accept decentralization and if they will acquire the knack of enlisting and effectively using the services of volunteers.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower at Columbia University often

remarked, "Most people look for complex erudite answers to their problems. I find that the right answers are usually simple ones if I can just locate them." So it is with continuous fund raising. The key answers are so simple as to be often overlooked; it's decentralize and acquire the knack of having large numbers of effective volunteers.

A PRAIRIE SAGA*

(Book Review)

SAMUEL S. GEORGE

PRESIDENT, JAMESTOWN COLLEGE

AN ALUMNUS said to me recently, "When I was a student Dr. Kroeze was away from the campus much of the time. But we knew he was getting money for the college—either for buildings or endowments. He was doing something for us, and we were proud." Dr. Kroeze's trips away from the campus and back were events; events for students as well as for the fortunes and destiny of the college.

Now, out of profound maturity he has achieved another event in the life of the college he loves and of which he is so justly proud. He has written a book about the college and its place in the higher educational life of the great northwest. He argues ably for the kind and quality of education he has championed through the years, and with courage tells of the difficulties that were encountered on the way. The book is a romance of education and an unfolding of a philosophy at once compelling and refreshing.

It is a book about the college and the personalities who gave him much of the substance with which they were endowed for its erection and maintenance. Warm, human, vivid, it is a book of rich memory and grateful appreciation. Withal, it flickers and scintillates and sometimes burns with passion and conviction and sure wisdom in regard to the meaning of Christian higher education in our American culture.

You get the impression as you read *A PRAIRIE SAGA* that the men and women of vast wealth from whom President Kroeze secured gifts to build the college were people of outstanding personal ability, charm and Christian conviction and devotion. You are made aware of the fact that they were genuinely concerned about finding good causes upon which to lavish their philanthropy.

* *A Prairie Saga* by B. H. Kroeze, with *Brief Memoirs* by Jeannette Gray Kroeze. The College Bookstore, Jamestown, North Dakota. 1952. 175 pp. \$3.00.

This is undoubtedly true. But true also is it that in approaching them, in telling his story, in appealing to them and in securing their participating interest in the growing college, Dr. Kroeze had an originality, a convincing manner, a compelling courtesy, a way with him that spoke eloquently of his own stature, personal ability, Christian conviction and devotion.

Here are recorded for us a few of these experiences. Here, too are set down tributes to the greatness and nobility of many people whose lives are also written deeply and permanently in the story of Jamestown College. Throughout the book, and also in a special chapter, is found the author's motivating philosophy, the ideas that gave the enterprise and his labors the dimension of depth. "Why The Christian College?" is a closely reasoned chapter, arguing as it does for a natural and normal combination of growth in mental, physical and spiritual qualities of life. "Higher education," says the author, "must always mean supremely, whatever else it may embody, the mental, physical and spiritual well-being of man. To that end the Christian colleges demand that the total program must be surcharged with the spiritual dynamic of Biblical truth."

An intriguing section of the book is made up of brief memoirs of the early life of Dr. Kroeze, written delightfully by Mrs. Kroeze. In flowing style with inimitable personal interest and understanding, and characteristic feminine figures of speech, the lady who graced the president's house and added both dignity and devotion to his labors has sketched the outlines of his life before he came to Jamestown. The volume is ably edited by Grace V. Watkins, '26, writer and poet, who I know looked upon the task as a labor of respect and love.

AMONG THE COLLEGES

BARNARD COLLEGE has been granted \$10,000 a year for three years by the New York Fund for Children, Inc., to finance a new interdepartmental program in education to help train undergraduates in elementary school teaching and which will include studies in psychology and the history and philosophy of education as well as practice teaching. This program will be taken in addition to a major in the student's chosen field.

THE ASSOCIATED COLLEGES AT CLAREMONT announce affiliation with the research and training center in botany and horticulture, the Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden which will continue its research program and will participate in the instruction in botany and horticulture in Claremont Graduate School and with that already offered by members of the Botany Department of Pomona College. The Botanic Garden was founded in 1927 by the late Susanna Bixby Bryant in memory of her father, a pioneer of California, for research on the native plants of the state. Part of the botanical library of the college, 3,500 books, is being combined with the Garden's library of 7,500 books. The Pomona College herbarium of 320,000 specimens is being housed in the Garden's new building with their herbarium of 80,000 specimens. The Garden will be open to the public in the spring of 1953.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY has received a grant of \$250,000 from the Fund for the Advancement of Education of the Ford Foundation to train teachers for the elementary schools. The program will offer professional work of a seminar-internship type to prepare liberal arts graduates for careers in teaching in the elementary schools. Applicants for participation are being accepted by the School of Education, Stone Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY has been given \$2500 by the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation to be used for scholarships with preference given to children of per-

sons employed in public service, including the armed forces and the judiciary.

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE FOR WOMEN has received a grant of \$350,000 from the Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation for the construction of a social studies building if the college can raise a similar sum from other sources. The college has received also \$350,000 from the Buhl Foundation for construction of a humanities building to be named for Cora Helen Coolidge, president of the college from 1922 to 1933.

SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY has received \$1,500,000 in the will of Mrs. J. W. Fincher, Texas clubwoman, to build a school of business administration as a memorial to her husband who until his death three years ago was vice president of the Houston National Bank. The building will be known as the Joseph Wylie Fincher Memorial Business Administration Building.

SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE through the aid of the Broadhurst Foundation has established 25 full-tuition and fees scholarships for pre-ministerial students. Mr. William Broadhurst is a trustee of the college.

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY announces its Tenth Annual Reading Institute, February 2-6, 1953 to emphasize the needs for an integrated program of reading in every phase of the child's school curriculum by discussion and demonstration. Advance registration is required. For further information write Emmett Albert Bates, Director, The Reading Clinic, Temple University, Broad and Montgomery Avenue, Philadelphia 22, Pennsylvania.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI has received a grant of \$250,000 from the General Education Board for improvement of the liberal arts program for undergraduates. The Board of Trustees of Institutions of Higher Learning of the State of Mississippi has agreed to make available an additional \$500,000 above the University's regular budget to match the GEB's grant, two to one. Mr. and Mrs. Robert C. Carrier of Sardis, Missis-

issippi, have given the University \$500,000 to build an engineering building.

UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO has established under the sponsorship of three prominent glass companies a Graduate Institute in Silicate Chemistry and Related Sciences for exclusive research and instruction in applications of physical chemistry to silicate technology. Libbey-Owens-Ford, Owens-Illinois and Owens-Corning Fiberglas will furnish grants totaling \$75,000 and the University will add \$50,000 for a five-year period. Director of the Institute will be Dr. Wilhelm Eitel, formerly engaged by the Office of Naval Research in research in the synthesis of silicate minerals.

NEW COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

- American University, Washington, D. C. Hurst R. Anderson, President, Hamline University, St. Paul, Minnesota.
- Bessie Tift College, Forsyth, Georgia. Carey T. Vinzant, Pastor, First Baptist Church, Fitzgerald, Georgia.
- Brevard College, Brevard, North Carolina. Robert H. Stamey, Pastor, Commonwealth Church, Charlotte, North Carolina.
- Carroll College, Waukesha, Wisconsin. Robert D. Steele, President, Westminster College, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Howell H. Brooks, Acting President.
- College of the City of New York, New York. Buell G. Gallagher, United States Assistant Commissioner of Education.
- Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa. Ernest D. Nielsen, Pastor, Trinity Lutheran Church, Chicago, Illinois.
- Hastings College, Hastings, Nebraska. Dale D. Welch.
- Huron College, Huron, South Dakota. John R. Williams, Pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Wooster, Ohio.
- Huston-Tillotson College, Austin, Texas. Matthew S. Davage, Secretary, Department of Higher Education for Negroes, Board of Education of the Methodist Church, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Loyola University, New Orleans, Louisiana. W. Patrick Donnelly, President, Spring Hill College, Spring Hill, Alabama.
- Mercy College, Detroit, Michigan. Sister Mary Lucille Middleton, Acting President.
- Millsaps College, Jackson, Mississippi. H. Ellis Finger, Jr., Pastor.
- Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus, Mississippi. Charles P. Hogarth, Gulf Park College, Gulfport, Mississippi.
- New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas, New Mexico. Thomas C. Donnelly, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
- New Mexico Western College, Silver City, New Mexico. J. Cloyd Miller, Superintendent of Schools at Deming, New Mexico and President of the National Education Association.
- Quincy College, Quincy, Illinois. Julian Woods, Instructor in Economics.

Reed College, Portland, Oregon. Duncan S. Ballantine, Professor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

St. Edward's University, Austin, Texas. Elmo Bransby.

San Diego State College, California. Malcolm A. Love, President, University of Nevada, Reno.

San Jose State College, California. John T. Wahlquist, Dean, School of Education, University of Utah, Salt Lake City.

Siena College, Loudonville, New York. Bertrand J. Campbell, Provincial of the Holy Name Province of the Order of Friars Minor.

Southeastern Louisiana College, Hammond, Louisiana. Clark L. Barrow, Superintendent of Schools, East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana.

Spring Hill College, Spring Hill, Alabama. Andrew C. Smith.

Stockton College, Stockton, California. Julio L. Bortolazzo, Superintendent of Schools, Oswego, Oregon.

University of Nevada, Reno. Minard W. Stout, Professor of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee. Edward McCrady, Jr., Acting President.

University of Vermont, Burlington. Carl W. Borgmann, Dean of Faculties, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

University of Washington, Seattle. Henry Schmitz, Dean, College of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Virginia. William H. Milton, Jr., Manager, Operating Department, Knoll's Atomic Power Laboratory, General Electric Company, Schenectady, New York.

COLLEGE AND CHURCH

VOLUME XVII

FALL, 1952

NUMBER 3

Catholic Educators and Public Education, <i>Paul C. Reinert</i> ...	446
Can Religious Education Be Patriotic, <i>Andrew C. Rockover</i>	449
Perspectives Which Challenge and Threaten, <i>Walter Pope</i> <i>Binns</i>	453
Why the Christian College?, <i>Barend H. Kroeze</i>	457
Editorial Items	469

COLLEGE AND CHURCH is the educational news bulletin of the Commission on Christian Higher Education of the Association of American Colleges. The opinions expressed in the various articles are those of the respective authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Commission. They are presented in conformity with the policy of this publication which provides for freedom of discussion concerning problems of Christian higher education.

CATHOLIC EDUCATORS AND PUBLIC EDUCATION

PAUL C. REINERT

President, St. Louis University

ALMOST to a discouraging degree, our duties as Catholic educators are multiplying and becoming more complex. We have new obligations within the sphere of our own Catholic educational activities. Still more challenging is the fact that today we have new problems arising out of our responsibilities to American education generally, the duties which we as American citizens have towards all schools and all educators.

There is no point in hiding the fact that a significant portion of the tension which is evident in the United States today because of the church-state issue and conflicts in religious beliefs centers on our Catholic school system. This situation, I submit, poses a thorny problem for us which is not easily solved. We could make some serious mistakes, especially if we were to start a name-calling campaign of our own on the style of Paul Blanchard. Above all, let us not do or say anything which would give our fellow Americans a false picture of the Catholic attitude towards the public school system of this country.

What should our attitude be? Historically, we have had and, please God, we probably always will have a diversified system of education in this country. As American citizens, therefore, and especially as American educators, we must be interested in the improvement not only of our own unique kind of education but of all kinds of American education—public, private, denominational—whatever it may be. Anyone who has read the Decrees of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore held in 1884 will sense the spirit of that section of the document which deals with secular education. Briefly, it states that secular education is, of course, incomplete and unsatisfactory for Catholics since we are convinced that good education is a way of life which should be permeated throughout with the principles of religion. Never-

NOTE: Excerpts from an address given at the closing general session of the National Catholic Educational Association, April 18, 1952 and printed in *College Newsletter* of May 19.

theless, the public schools, as a complementary system to private education, are absolutely necessary for the thousands of Americans who are content with a purely secular educational pattern. Such schools deserve the interest and support of our Catholic population. Criticism of the defects of public education is entirely legitimate provided that criticism is reasonable, practical, and, above all, constructive. I fear that by imprudent attacks on public education, some Catholics are not only doing nothing positive towards improving non-Catholic education but are actually hurting the cause of Catholic education by fomenting unnecessary resentment on the part of many honest public educators and the exemplary Catholics who are teaching in our public schools.

Negatively, let's refrain from vitriolic, emotional invective against public education: positively, let's see if we cannot do a better job in interpreting ourselves and our educational objectives to American non-Catholics. Here again we have ever-increasing responsibilities. The modern public school educator is brought up on a diet of terminology (jargon, if you will) which too many of us do not understand any more than they understand our traditional, age-old, philosophical way of expressing ideas very familiar to us. And so our terminology is jargon to them too. Let's take at least part of the time we may be tempted to spend in denunciation and devote it to a concerted effort to interpret our ideas to the minds of other American educators and through them to the non-Catholic American public.

This new obligation binds you not to foster within yourselves nor your students an attitude which will directly militate against the establishment of effective means of communication and understanding between non-Catholics and ourselves. The best description I have heard of this attitude is the "Ghetto mentality." The fact that Jewish people were required by law to live in certain restricted sections of the cities developed in them a certain clanishness, a tribal approach in all their thinking which is characteristic of a persecuted minority. We Catholics are not beyond the influence of this Ghetto mentality. If not guarded against, it can arouse our emotions to a point where we label movements and ideas as "Catholic" when as a matter of fact the Church has actually taken no official position whatsoever. Even

worse, this attitude can make us too quick to accept all opposition as bigoted anti-Catholicism. Unquestionably, there is far too much bigotry abroad today, but we must realize that there are many people in this country who, even though they do not agree with us, are certainly not bigoted.

We Catholic educators should take a realistic position dictated by the fact that we are also American citizens living in a democracy. In almost every field of thought—politics, education, religion—variety, disagreement, opposition is the order of the day. The wrong way to face this situation is to retreat into isolation, to take refuge in the haven of our own righteousness, to indulge in bitter criticism, to seem to refuse to work for the common good. The right way is for us to accept what the concept of democracy literally means—the privilege and responsibility of joining with our fellow-citizens in every action including education where we do not eliminate our God-given freedom nor seriously compromise our fundamental values and responsibilities. Recognizing frankly and realistically that diversity is with us probably to stay, we must foster the faith in our own convictions and the courage that will stimulate us to offer others our religious, moral, educational principles and values vigorously but always tactfully and charitably.

CAN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION BE PATRIOTIC?

ANDREW C. ROCKOVER

HEAD, ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, McMURRY COLLEGE

THE word "patriotism" was, and is, misinterpreted just as much as the word "democracy." The passion of the patriot to "his country" was given different presentations also in the history of our nation. In 1846, John J. Crittenden of Kentucky, referring in his speech before the Congress to President Polk's Mexican war message, exclaimed, "I hope to find my country in the right; however, I will stand by her, right or wrong." President Adams took quite an opposite position in his speech on slavery and unjust war when he said, "And say not thou my country right or wrong, nor shed thy blood for an unhallowed cause." G. K. Chesterton in his *Defendant*, even compared the principle, "my country right or wrong" to saying, "my mother drunk or sober."

Our children in schools also receive quite a confused idea of patriotism when they compare Byron's, "He who loves not this country, can love nothing" with Bernard Shaw's, "You'll never have a quiet world till you knock patriotism out of the human race"; and when they compare Charles Churchill's statement, "Who loves this country cannot hate mankind" with the statement which Boswell attributes to Dr. Johnson, "An appeal to patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel."

Let us then make it clear what we understand by patriotism. By an American patriot we understand one who exerts himself to promote the welfare of this country—one who is devoted to the great Christian and American heritage and is ready to defend the freedom and the rights of this country.

Let us also make clear that patriotism in our understanding is diametrically opposed to nationalism or chauvinism with the doctrine that certain nations are elected by God, or with the blind exaggerated enthusiasm for national glory and military expansion. To confuse patriotism with nationalism or fascism is committing the same mistake as confusing democracy with totalitarianism. Democracy rests upon Christian political foundations, while totalitarianism is based on the belief that Christianity

and democracy are devices by which the weak protect themselves and only the use of force and of violent methods can secure the progress of a nation.

If in our understanding of patriotism we include love for country and promotion of the welfare of the nation, can the Christian education be patriotic?

A Christian exalts love and sees in it the unifying force essential in building the brotherhood of nations; only the influence of the Christian principles can prevent making from patriotism a disguised hatred toward other nations. Christian love is constructive and not egotistic. The love of children for parents has no hatred or bitterness toward anyone. When we read in the preamble of our Constitution that it is established "to promote the general *welfare*," we should not forget the interpretation given by the Supreme Court of the United States (1892), holding that in the Declaration of Independence and in the constitution of all states there is to be found a profound reverence for religion and an assumption that its influence in all human affairs is essential to the *well-being* of the United States.

This is why the Constitution—the civil bible of the Americans—is considered to be an attempt to combine the teachings of the Bible with the science of government.

If we analyze the type of thought which claims to dominate in the United States, we will find it to be the evangelical-protestant tradition. The flow of clothing, money and other commodities to the prisoners released from concentration camps in Germany and Russia, the contribution of the United States to UNRRA or the parcels sent to Japan and Korea were calculated not only for economic and political reasons; they were the manifestations of the Christian motives of pity and sympathy with altruistic and moral qualities.

W. E. Sangster, the President of the Methodist Conference of Great Britain, wrote, "What most of us need is not so much a good memory as a good forgettery," and "Prayer is excellent if it creates receptivity to love, forgiveness, peace and poise." The Americans who defended the United States before the Japanese aggression are the ones who, called to Japan by the Church, are now reconstructing with Christian forgiveness and love the

schools which were burned and damaged during the years of the war.

The separation of church and state preserves our freedom of spirit; the state does not control our soul, but we cannot deny that the church contributed to the American way of life, to American freedom.

Christianity forms an operative part of our social ideas and strongly influences our standards of life. Because of Christianity in this country, the Nazi concentration camps with stoves to burn men of other races or the Communist concentration camps with groans of dying prisoners, are not known.

Christianity contributed to American freedom. In surrendering ourselves to Christ, we reject all slavery and force. Freedom can live and work only in the glory of the spirit of Christ.

In our concern for the preservation of freedom in our country, we are opposed to Communism in our education. We reject the philosophy of materialism and the concept of dictatorship; we repudiate hate and the war between classes as a creative force. As Christians we cannot be indifferent to the preservation of our independence, or to the independence of the members of the community of free nations.

The Communists all over the world are trying to subordinate the interests of their state to the benefit of a foreign country. They are collaborating with an expansive policy of a foreign imperialistic power; and in this way, they are helping to conquer and to destroy the independence of their homeland. The spy scandals of treachery proved that the Communist parties are agencies of a foreign power and that they pave the way for Russian imperialistic world dictatorship.

Our religious education is opposed to Communism because we believe that love and mutual goodness of all peoples are mightier than totalitarian slavery.

Our religious education is patriotic because we believe that democracy is the outgrowth of the religious conviction of the sacredness of every human life; in our education we distinguish between service of government and servitude to government.

Religious education is securing the welfare of the nation by bringing full understanding of the fact that it isn't enough that man be taught how to build things or how to operate compli-

cated machinery. If we neglect the spiritual side of life, we are lost. The service of Church education is in keeping the emphasis on spirituality, decency and man's dependence upon God.

In our Christian, patriotic education, we promote the aims which leaders of the United Nations have set forth: to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples; to reaffirm faith in the equal rights of men and women of all nations, *whether large or small*; to achieve international cooperation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedom for all without distinction of race, language or religion.

PERSPECTIVES WHICH CHALLENGE AND THREATEN

WALTER POPE BINNS

PRESIDENT, WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE

The privately-supported college has an essential function in the preservation of freedom.

It has been a part of the genius of higher education in America to preserve a balance between the tax-supported and privately-supported institutions. That balance has been shifting in recent years in favor of the public institutions. I do not begrudge one dollar of tax money that has gone to the support of higher education. Indeed, I wish I could feel that all of my tax money were as wisely expended. What I am saying is that it will be a sad day for education and for freedom in America if this trend continues to the point where the private college can no longer survive.

The lure of bigness in the life of the state universities is a peril to their freedom. As they grow larger, there is ever the need for more and larger appropriations. With these larger appropriations come more conditions attached to the spending of the money, more demands for control, more political influence on education, more insistence that the university shall reflect the attitudes of the government in power. The inevitable result of such a trend must be the danger of creeping socialism and a growing dependence upon the state. The threat upon the freedom of the university is both academic and economic.

I do not claim to know all the answers to this problem. I suggest that one answer is to welcome and aid the strengthening of the private colleges. They are in a peculiar position to help preserve the freedom of thought and action which is precious alike to those who teach and study in public and private colleges and universities. When you become concerned about your cherished freedom in the large state university, it will be some comfort to know that not far away are these smaller privately-supported colleges that love freedom with a passion closely akin to yours.

NOTE: Excerpts from address delivered at the 1952 General Conference of the American Alumni Council, Sun Valley, Idaho, July 14, 1952.

No one could intelligently question the need of the large universities. They must be the centers of scholarly research. They must maintain the schools for professional training. Students from the small colleges throughout the nation will look to the universities as the end of their dreams in scholarly attainment and in equipping themselves for service in business and in the professions. It is on the undergraduate level that the small college has its opportunity to function in a manner of which it need not be ashamed. Here the student not only has a better chance to come in close relation with the communicating personality of the highly cultured teacher, but he also has a better opportunity to know his fellow students and to be known by them. In his immature years, he has the congenial environment for self-expression, the associations which enable him to find himself, to discover and develop and test his powers. It is no accident or mere matter of chance that these small colleges have produced leaders out of all proportion to the size of their student bodies.

* * *

The small, privately-supported college—and particularly the Christian college—can take the initiative in a much needed challenge to the current over-emphasis upon “objectivity” in education. Among thoughtful people, there is a growing concern over the mass morality of the American people, corruption in high places and low, the apathy of the electorate, mass hypnosis in politics, vacillating opinions on matters of opinion, a national cynicism which says that every question has two sides and that there is not much to choose between the two sides. This is in part the result of an educational philosophy which has gained currency in recent years through the influence of certain well-known educational leaders.

I shall not enter into an argument as to whether the prophets of “progressive education” have been misinterpreted by their disciples or misunderstood by the public. I have only to say that “objectivity” has been carried to an extreme and that it has borne ill fruit. The teacher who is neutral on every question is no real teacher. It is not a requirement of intellectual respectability that one should be completely objective about integrity, justice, honesty, decency—or even about more controversial issues concerning democracy, human rights, individual responsi-

bility and the freedoms guaranteed in the American Constitution. We need a dynamic teaching which leads to robust beliefs, strong convictions and vigorous faiths. We need to repudiate the type of teaching which a friend of mine has said is turning college students into "intellectual eunuchs."

Without any invidious comparisons with other types of institutions, I can express the belief that we can trust the leadership of the smaller Christian colleges in this much-needed emphasis. We can well abandon some of our morbid fear about the danger of "indoctrination" in education. There is nothing essentially wrong about indoctrination—provided it is intelligent indoctrination. We are just now in the midst of a national political campaign where the very air we breathe is filled with indoctrination. The most conservative newspapers, the most respectable magazines are indoctrinating with all their might and the most entertaining features are crowded off the television screens by the indoctrinators. No one objects to that. Why should the colleges feel that they must observe strict neutrality on every vital issue for fear of someone doubting their intellectual objectivity?

The Christian college can place the needed emphasis upon the moral and spiritual element in education. This century has experienced more scientific development than any other period in all human history. We have made marvelous progress in the mastery of the scientific means by which we live. Our problem is that we have not made a corresponding progress in understanding the ends for which we live. We have mastered the forces of nature and made them serve our purpose in all manner of physical conveniences. We have not kept pace in our interpretation of the meaning and purpose of life. Dr. Robert A. Millikan, winner of the Nobel Prize in physics, said that the world could well afford to declare a moratorium of fifty years in scientific progress, and profitably spend those fifty years catching up in spiritual progress. Wise man that he is, Dr. Millikan knows that there will be no moratorium on scientific progress. We are on the threshold of the greatest period of scientific progress we have ever known. The only hope is that education will wisely interpret the situation and will assume its responsibility along with the church and the home in emphasizing the moral and spiritual values of life.

We have already said that moral conviction is essential if education is to meet the needs of the whole man. It must now be said that the soundest moral character ultimately rests upon the foundation of religious faith.

It is a highly controversial question as to how far a tax-supported institution can go in encouraging religious teaching without violating the American constitutional principle of separation of church and state. The Supreme Court has recently handed down decisions which set certain definite limits. I am in hearty agreement with those decisions. We cannot use tax funds to support the teaching of religion. To do so would violate the rights of taxpayers who differ in their religious beliefs. It follows also that tax-supported schools should not adopt attitudes hostile to religion. There is no provision of the Constitution or principle of government that would prevent teachers or students in state colleges from being actively religious in all their personal relationships. There are many legal ways in which the churches can carry on effective religious programs among the personnel of state institutions. It is not the desire of any intelligent person that religious character and conviction shall be confined to those students who attend church-related colleges.

All of that having been said, it remains that the Christian college is in a unique position to provide the definite religious teaching which is the strongest force to produce the moral character so desperately needed in American life today. Without embarrassment, these colleges can teach Bible courses in Christian ethics. The teachers of such courses should be as competent and as highly trained as any other teachers in the college. Courses in religion must be conducted on a high intellectual level, or they will not command the respect of the students. When they are so conducted, they will not suffer by comparison. They will have their rightful place of respectability in the liberal arts curriculum and will contribute that "something extra" in the development of character.

In discussing the distinctive contribution of the small liberal arts Christian college, we have suggested some of the perspectives which challenge and threaten education in general. The problems are those that concern all educational institutions alike, the large and the small, state schools and private schools.

WHY THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE?

BAREND H. KROEZE

President Emeritus, Jamestown College

It is axiomatic that there is nothing in the world comparable with education in a true and full development of life in our youth and for leadership. Upon the character and thoroughness of education, therefore, depend the perpetuity and the welfare of our Democracy.

That the parallel system of education, known as the tax-supported and privately-endowed institutions of higher learning, has been fostered and encouraged, and in consequence has thrived to a remarkable degree of perfection, is an eloquent testimony to the sound judgment and wisdom of the American people. Both types are not the mere product of chance. They are the logical outcome of sound educational procedure and theory and statesmanship; and today they are the glory of our land of enduring worth, distributing their beneficent influence in a constantly enlarged stream of loyal and efficient citizenship and leadership—the chief guarantee for the perpetuity of our nation and the strength of our freedoms and democratic institutions. That “Education, Morality, and Religion shall forever be encouraged” requires the true devotion and adherence to the present system of parallelism, for neither the one nor the other alone could advance this trinity of the American concept of life as a nation.

It is the contention of the Christian colleges, privately endowed and well equipped, that “Education, Morality, and Religion” cannot be divorced and at the same time the founding principles of our citizenship be safeguarded and advanced.

However unintentional, there is a lot of loose thinking these days of so called liberal thought and likewise much indifference manifested by people generally along this line; and to clear our thinking on this question and to look at the subject dispassionately and from a true perspective, I will first mention a few mis-statements and erroneous arguments touching these institutions.

NOTE: This is Chapter VIII, with a few omissions, from a PRAIRIE SAGA which is reviewed in this issue of the Bulletin.

In the first place, the tax-supported universities and the colleges on a private foundation are not competitive. It is, unfortunately, a widely conceived view that they are. Their relation in our system of education is better expressed by the term cooperative. The dominance of either type would be a great misfortune; in fact, destructive to our American way of life. They are mutually helpful and corrective. Leading educators voice the opinion, and justly so, that the Christian colleges have exercised a very wholesome influence in the life and work of the State institutions; and, on the other hand, the State institutions have stimulated scholarship and standards in the privately endowed institutions. But more than that, each type is constantly seeking to find methods of cooperation and interrelation of courses and improved standards for the best advancement in education and for the good of our professions and citizenship.

It is apparent that as our population grows and the demands for the best in education increase through our Educational Associations and Conferences, this cooperative spirit will more and more manifest itself in a highly correlated endeavor, each type of institution performing the task for which it is best fitted. The privately endowed colleges will more and more have their emphases in the domain of the general cultural undergraduate courses and study; while, on the other hand, our tax-supported universities will stress the graduate areas in education and the professional, technical and independent research with their splendid facilities. The future relation, in my judgment, of the tax-supported universities and the privately endowed colleges in each state will be a definitely correlated activity, with the college work of general cultural education done by the colleges where it can be done better, and the graduate, professional, technical and advanced research by the universities, which is their distinctive and peculiar and recognized domain in higher education. In the language of the late President Edmund James, of the University of Illinois—"The colleges are here to do their work of preparation for the still higher branches of learning, and the day is not far distant when only such college-prepared men will be permitted to enter the universities." President James B. Angell, of the University of Michigan, with whom I often discussed student life on the University campus, used to

say—"If I had my way, no person should be allowed on the University campus below the junior year; it is not within the function of the University properly to train others who have no collegiate and disciplinary background."

The logic in the case of the Christian colleges on a private foundation is found: (A) in the astonishing increase of the number of students in America; (B) in the very nature and organization of these institutions; (C) in the remarkable increase in facilities, equipment and financial stability of the colleges on a private foundation.

It takes a seer to forecast the future, and I do not claim to be one. However, higher education has been in vogue for so many years that clearly defined lines of development and trends have revealed themselves which will naturally only move in ever enlarging circles. It is true that there will be fads; there have always been fads. Some school men love to arrest attention to different schemes as if they have never been tried before—frequently due to ignorance of educational history—until an aroused public make violent protests; but fundamental truths in the training of personalities, the absorbing function of education, have made deep roots and will persist as long as human nature is what it is and seeks security and happiness in a varying social, economic and industrial world—the product of this search for stability and truth.

(A) Take the fact of growth. In 1928 there were in the institutions of higher learning 1,053,955 students, a then high. But in 1947 there were 2,338,226, a tremendous increase. The emphasis is not on less but on more education, and it should not be surprising to find the increase in the next decade even greater, because education has captured the minds of the people and has become the big business of the nation. In addition to this we must remember that the public schools have enormously increased in their attendance. In the past twenty years the increase has been over 3,000,000 and the postwar increase in children will accentuate this increase even more. In earlier years the universities never exceeded four figures; now they boast of five figures. One claims 24,000 students in regular attendance; another as high as 40,000. They seem not only to vie with one another, but to boast of their growth. They have become the greatest pub-

licity agency in America, with the most skillful and intriguing methods to attract the youth of the land. The time may come when the citizens of any state could be taxed to a burdensome degree to educate the youth coming from all other states, if not from over the world. The privately endowed colleges likewise are speeding up their enrolments. Whereas formerly many limited their attendance due to sound educational principles, they now have doubled their enrolments. It is inconceivable that this vast body of our youth could be provided with an adequate education such as American culture demands, except on the basis of the work done by these parallel types of institutions of higher learning. In fact, in this connection it should be said, and unfortunately so, that many people fail to realize the very large and significant part colleges on a private foundation are serving in the educated product turned out each year. The idea of bigness has blinded the eyes of our citizenship to the truth (an astounding truth, too) of the large stream of splendidly educated men and women flowing each year from the independent colleges. There are according to the U. S. Office of Education close to 1000 of them. The ratio of the two types over the years may fluctuate, but it is reasonable to believe the remarkable values of both will remain about the same. The line of growth in the one type parallels the line of growth in the other.

(B) Again, the perpetuity of the colleges on a private foundation is found in their very nature, purpose and organization. The university is organized for independent research, the graduate, professional and technical fields of learning, and does not seek as its function and purpose particularly to touch and train the individual life of the student, nor to accentuate traits of character and spiritual life. What there is of this influence and culture must come from without, through organizations off the campus, controlled and directed by religious bodies or associations, which, at best, can only indirectly awaken interest in spiritual things and profound Bible study. The separation of Church and State is the basic rock upon which our Democracy is founded—it must ever be held sacred and inviolate. Even the slight contacts by these outside organizations are watched and opposed by the extreme advocates of the separation of Church and State. The college on a private foundation, however, thor-

oughly committed to and firmly espousing this sacred principle, is founded for the express purpose of building character, to stimulate Christian ideals alongside mental accuracy, intellectual discipline and scientific study; strictly in keeping with the national conviction that, "Education, Morality and Religion shall forever be encouraged." To this end these colleges are free from all political, warping and narrowing influences. We should have no illusions on this point. Political zeal and selfishness and greed, dialectical materialism with its brood of lusts and vices which crush the soul hunger of men and women for humanistic and cultural values in life, find no encouragement nor atmosphere in their activities and sacred halls of learning. The vital concern of these colleges is to create "a passion for thoroughness, a passion to discriminate right from wrong and a passion for unselfish service"; an unfoldment of Christian character created in the image of God. To challenge the life of every student with these prerogatives to honorable living, Christian faith and true citizenship, two processes are deemed imperative in higher education, namely, formal instruction in religious truth, and a wholesome Christian atmosphere.

Formal instruction is that function in education that will "direct the mental faculties of a person by instruction, training and discipline, in such a way as to develop and render efficient the natural powers; develop a man physically, mentally and spiritually." This is a bare statement of formal instruction and needs elucidation. It demands close personal processes of teaching for the acquisition of facts, with laboratory facilities for practical experimentation and the testing of these facts, in the entire domain of knowledge as the groundwork for wisdom and understanding—in the world's captivating literatures, in the achievements in art and music, in the social and historical and economic interpretation of the great movements of mankind in which are to be found the dreams and fears and hopes and struggles for human satisfactions, in the fascinating philosophies of great souls in the search for truth. The Christian colleges maintain that "Wisdom is the principal thing, therefore, get wisdom, and in all thy getting get understanding." Christian truth, both revealed and discovered, is within that domain, and instruction therein must be treated exactly as any other subject of knowledge

scientifically by practical experimentation, and with the world's supreme book, the Bible, as a text. It is very important to remember that this religious instruction must be done in conjunction with other subjects of investigation and study in the same institution, with the same recognition in the curriculum as the subjects of science and history and sociology and literature and technical courses, if spiritual convictions and powers are to play an equal part in life with mental and physical powers. The tragic fact in higher education under public control is the divorce of religious training at the very time when our youth need it the most, at the time when the mind is closely applied in the great and captivating study of the sciences and literature and history and economics. The governing wheel is gone; the divine dynamic for the interpretation of truth is absent. To deny our youth the inexhaustible "resources," as someone has said, "which have inspired the greatest number of people to right living and unselfish service for the past two thousand years" is not only to embolden the future generations away from the sanctions of religion and the appreciation of honor and justice and morality and integrity in life, but also a distinct educational loss. The social order can never rise higher than the motives of the people, and the challenge to our higher educational institutions is the creation of these motives. That is more than the mere stimulation of the mind by general facts.

Probably no set of men are emphasizing the truth here mentioned more than the business men of our nation, and if what they contend is true, it is very significant that these Christian colleges are making the fullness of life through religious instruction and training an integral part of their curriculum; seeking thereby to emphasize that making a life is as important as making a living. Roger W. Babson, who through the years has often registered the pulse of business men, is credited with these stirring words—"Business stability rests upon the motives and purposes of the people. These motives and purposes are directed in the right direction only through religion. Legislation, bounties, or force are of no avail in determining man's attitude toward life. Harmony at home and peace with the world will only be determined in the same way. The need of the hour is more education based on the plain teachings of Jesus. With the forces of evil backed by men of money, systematically organized to destroy, we must back

with men and money all campaigns for Christian education." Our country is in greater need of enlightened morality, courage and the common virtues of honesty and integrity than of commercialized trained brains. Keen intellectual culture is highly to be commended, but it alone may make smart men devoid of religious truth and the safeguards of spiritual insight, and more dangerous to a nation than men of ignorance and illiteracy. Surely it was no mere sentiment that prompted Achermann, the historian of the French Revolution, to pen the astonishing words—"The highly cultured men and women of France found their highest pleasure and spent their time in the most abominable sensualities and deeds of murder, and who together with this sought always to display their mental cultivation in the most splendid manner in public and social life!" George Washington in his concept of education counseled the people of our growing nation—"Let us with caution indulge in the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles."

If the higher education, therefore, of our youth during the crystallization of their formative years, and largely away from their home influences and the Church, and while they are learning the great facts of the world and life, is not definitely committed to building character as an intrinsic part of their learning, when will Christian character be formed and how will personal and national morality and spiritual vigor and conviction be obtained? If religion is an inherent force moulding character and is not definitely integrated in all learning in higher education, how can the menace of lawlessness and vice and crime be averted? We claim to be a Christian people and to believe in God, but if He has no place or claim in soul uplift in the very act and process of intellectual acquisition, then where are we to expect to find our Christian leadership in world affairs and an upright social order of righteousness which alone can exalt a nation? Theodore Roosevelt said—"If we educate a man's mind and do not educate a man's morals, we educate a menace to society." It is true that outside organizations are seeking to meet this situation, such as Westminster Foundation, Wesley Foundation and others, and

they have a valuable place for voluntary participation in religious endeavor off the campus for the very few who probably least need it, but sadly ineffective in the whole area of higher education. The best that can be said is that it is approach to a problem in applied Christianity; actually only a side-show, not under the main tent. The virtues of religious sanctions must come from within the nature of the institution itself, in classroom instruction and chapel worship. If such virtues are not gained there, no amount of external off-campus organization will bring them about. Religion and morality are not just absorbed from without; ethical character is not hypodermically injected; a "veneer of religion" will not build a stalwart righteous nation.

Then, in the second place, the formal instruction must be in an atmosphere which is conducive to the building of noble character. It is universally conceded that we cannot get away from the influence of religious belief and faith as a factor in civilization; that the environment, or atmosphere of religious faith is a masterly force in shaping ideals and habits and modes of thinking and living. Every educational institution has an atmosphere, or climate differing in degrees and character. In fact, it is difficult to comprehend anything that does not have an atmosphere, or climate peculiar to itself. If we take a book and read it, we soon sense its atmosphere, its climate. If we read Carlyle and then to Kant, how different the climate! We meet the same lofty intellectual clime, yet easily feel the different breezes wafting from the one than from the other. If we read Moses or one of the Prophets, how different we feel at once when we pass over to Luke or John. It seems as if we have taken a train or boat and passed from an oriental world to a new, from a frigid zone of frozen and stern commands to the calm repose of a southern lovely air filled with the song of birds. It is only the difference of atmosphere or climate. The Old Testament breathes forth a different soul power than the New Testament, and I think we are all agreed that it is more to our taste and comfort and right thinking to live in the latter than in the former. The difference is so great that it is probably not far from the truth to say that the terrible World War II, with its horrible atrocities, was due to the absence of the latter atmosphere with its sympathy and love and sacrifice, its supreme regard for the welfare of others, in the life of a once great nation. The climate of the days of

Goethe and Heine and Schiller, which was rich in the acquisition of knowledge and learning, facile in beautiful expression of the deep emotions of the soul, brilliant in wisdom and understanding of life's meaning and human relations—a golden age when nobility was based upon the conception that knowledge is power, that the enlightenment of the mind is wisdom, that love for others is the essence of religion and justice, that individual worth and greatness are the glory of a nation—was lost under the iron heel and the intoxication and lust for greed and power.

Just so is the fact of atmosphere, the environment in our universities and colleges which tells mightily on the attitude and life and character of the students. There should be no illusion about that. We easily feel this difference in climate, or atmosphere, as we go from one institution of higher education to another, just as we do in reading one book after another. We sense it in a multiplicity of things: in the type of buildings, in the landscaping and the character of the campus, in the conversation caught here and there, in the tone and spirit of instruction—in the innumerable human relationships everywhere. Some people justify the opprobrium that some institutions of learning are "knowledge factories" where the buildings and general life are not dissimilar from shops to turn out an article called students from the assembly line in mass production and streamlined alike; where the subtle lure of high thinking, noble purpose and sincere honorable living are not very apparent in the product. In fact, one can tell how many presidents some institutions have had by the number of different types of buildings, by the hodgepodge of colors and materials misshaped, with seemingly no conception of creating a cultural atmosphere. The same thing is true in the living quarters! What a mess administrators have made for correct living! The heavy mortality, especially in the first year away from home, of otherwise fine young men and women whose future would have been noble and pure and happy through the sunshine of personal sympathy, the beauty of purity and the rich counseling of Christian love and faith, is due to a large degree to the shifting as best they can off the campus and under all forms of adverse conditions—social, economic and otherwise. Likewise the attitude and contacts with instructors are a large feature of this climate. With universities already claiming

25,000 students and over, with classes announced as large as 1300, the problem is tremendous in the lives of our youth; especially is this true where the instructors are not dedicated to the high purpose of character building and the Bible is not integrated as an essential part of the curriculum, and the Chapel is not the throbbing heart of spiritual inspiration—a beautiful structure for religious exercises, meditation and devotion. The atmosphere is the aura of all these various forces, which in a Christian college stem from the high purpose of Biblical truth.

(C) Finally, the third basis which forms the logic in the case of the Christian colleges is that they are on a private foundation in the benevolent field with ever-increasing financial stability. The great American sin is the strange persistency to abjure small beginnings; to be irritatingly impatient with the natural laws of growth; to "scorn the base degrees by which we did ascend," as Shakespeare puts it; to worship at the shrine of bigness as if it were the criterion of quality and success—the very element in higher education that is destructive of high quality. The word "small" is constantly connected, therefore, with the private colleges in America, and often in derision as indicative of poverty in resources rather than as limitation in the number of students for the purpose of enabling personal contacts, directed supervision, intimate association and culture for leadership. Scholars are not born but trained individually. The very strength of these colleges, therefore, has often been turned into scorn. Small in the number of students in each and purposely so, but in the aggregate large with approximately fifty per cent of the students in America within their sacred halls. Mr. George Lorimer puts it this way—"The very limitations of the small institution preserve it from the danger of becoming unwieldy, top-heavy or overextended. Its very smallness encourages individuality rather than standardization. The human contacts are closer. Men play a larger and freer part. They are not overwhelmed by complex social life and over-elaborate administration. There is as much to be said for the simple life in education as in the world at large. In all essentials a college is merely a group of teachers and learners. A dozen young men gathered in a quiet shady place might be the kernel of an institution of the soundest learning, if a Plato sat in their midst." As a matter of fact, all educational institutions have had small

beginnings—they did not spring Jove-like into being. The University of Illinois can look back to an annual revenue of only \$3,750; the University of Wisconsin had to content itself with an income of only \$600 the first year. The same thing is true of other universities. Today they are colossal in their combined wealth and influence, and we love to point to them with pride as the marvel in educational history.

On the other hand, within the field occupied by the colleges on a private foundation a similar growth toward stability has taken place wherever sound administrative judgment has prevailed. Oberlin began in a corn field; Harvard, founded in poverty and an appeal to England for help, can boast of an endowment of \$184,000,000; Princeton, the successor of Tennant's primitive "Log College," has an endowment of \$45,000,000. These and others have attained to gigantic proportions, but we must not be dazzled thereby nor blinded to the inherent forces operative to the same end in other colleges under the genius of our American system of benefaction. To a less extent, of course, but nevertheless with like vitality and energy, and in much less time, many colleges on a private foundation, especially those strategically located and efficiently administered in the varied states of the Union, are rapidly marching forward to large financial strength and educational standing. Probably never before in the history of the world has there been such an accumulation in endowments and such an exhibition of large benefactions as during the past two decades. Colleges have added millions upon millions to their resources, emphasizing the fact that their permanency and efficiency are assured.

Great credit in this stimulation in finances must be given to the philanthropic foundations that were formed in this era, such as the General Education Board (sometimes referred to as the Rockefeller Foundation), the Carnegie Corporation of the City of New York, and many others in various sections of our nation. There is no question but that these and similar organizations incited a nation-wide impulse in benevolent giving—a spirit for good which has made America great among the nations of the earth. They have also stimulated the churches to play their part; and quickened under the sense of their spiritual responsibility should always be the foundation of an ever-flowing stream of benevolent goodwill in the building of Christian character—

the glory of our freedom and our democratic institutions. The heart of America will ever be pulsating generosity.

In conclusion, therefore, the Christian colleges amply justify their place in the great educational program of the land, with the Bible in the very heart of the institutions, taught by men with equal standing and rank in scholarship as in other fields of intellectual inquiry, and in a climate conducive to spiritual culture. As a Christian nation founded in religion, we cannot escape the fact that unless the old term religion, coined in controversy, if you please, and in the adventure of man to find happiness and enlightenment and social and economic justice, can find its spiritual unfoldment and Biblical content on our college campuses to quicken and undergird the lives of our educated leadership, we cannot expect righteousness in our nation, honest dealings among our fellowmen, or a new social order wherein human personality is evaluated of genuine worth and all receive a just share in the benefits of life. Higher education must always mean supremely, whatever else it may embody, the mental, physical and spiritual well-being of man. To that end the Christian colleges demand that the total program must be surcharged with the spiritual dynamic of Biblical truth.

I would liken Christian higher education to a stream that flows on from its source into ever-widening channels until it reaches its ultimate destiny in the limitless sea of life. Its high source is found in the matchless teachings and great life-giving purpose of our Master, and it has widened its banks through the ages of misunderstanding and wrong thinking, giving new life and vitality and inspiration and courage to humankind amid the desert wastes of immorality and evil and wickedness in high and low places; sweeping on and undeterred to its ultimate destiny of a redeemed society, made up of men and women who love God and their fellowmen. At any given point in its sweep we may not see great progress, but its march is nevertheless steady and onward, its force is always persistent against all barriers, its purpose always the same, its teachings the genuine principles of righteousness and goodwill to man; its power ever increasing in volume to destroy the evil forces of ignorance and wrong which undermine noble character, happiness and universal peace.

EDITORIAL ITEMS

THE CONFERENCE OF CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGES OF THE SOUTH is scheduling its next meeting for December 1, 1952, at Memphis, Tennessee. According to custom it will be held in connection with the Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The officers of the group for this year are President Harwell G. Davis of Howard College, *Chairman*; President Clyde A. Milner, Guilford College, *Vice Chairman*; President Peyton N. Rhodes of Southwestern, *Treasurer*; and President Charles W. Burts of Shorter College, *Secretary*.

THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGES IN THE WEST CENTRAL AREA is announced by Chairman M. Earle Collins, President of Missouri Valley College, to be held November 15, 1952 upon invitation of President Carl M. Reinert in the Law Building of Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska.

AT THE LAST MEETING of the Church-Related Colleges in the West Central Area the Chairman was authorized to appoint a committee "to restudy the functions and objectives of the annual regional meeting to ascertain how better to face the practical aspects of our unique educational task." He appointed the following to serve on this committee: President David L. Crawford of Doane College, President Nelson P. Horn of Baker University and President Carl M. Reinert of Creighton University.

This committee has made the following report:

As a basis for the desired "restudy" we listed the functions which these annual meetings now seem to be performing as follows:

1. *Fellowship*—An opportunity for presidents, deans and faculty members to meet their counterparts in other institutions and exchange views and experiences.
2. *Problems*—From papers, discussions and conversations to obtain help in meeting problems on the home campus.
3. *Policies*—To compare one's policies, plans and program with those of other similar institutions.
4. *Ideas*—To pick up new ideas for development at home.
5. *Objectives*—A good opportunity to set one's sights and adjust perspective with reference to important objectives.
6. *Attitude toward National Affairs and Problems*—To adjust perspective on national issues and affairs, such as U.M.T., mobilization, etc.

Your Committee is of the opinion that these functions are of considerable importance and value. It is possible that the meetings have gradually gotten into something of a rut and if so, some change or changes would seem desirable, provided they are of such a nature so as not to destroy the values noted above. Your Committee has no recommendations to make for any drastic change but does desire to submit the following suggestions to you for such consideration as you and the officers of the Organization may think this merits:

1. It is our recommendation that for next year we try to restrict the breadth of our central theme to manageable dimensions, with one main speaker in the forenoon to be given an hour or an hour and a half for giving us the basis for a subsequent discussion. It is our thought that this first presentation would carry us to the lunch hour and that instead of having a luncheon speaker we begin a discussion of the main topic around the luncheon table in the groups which naturally form at the tables. There should be some plan for organizing this part of the meeting, so that it will be fruitful of results. Following the luncheon discussion session, we should then continue a discussion of the central topic either in the whole group or breaking it up into two, three or more groups, whichever may seem more desirable to your Executive Committee. If the group is divided into several small discussion groups, then the final hour of the afternoon should be reserved for a meeting of the whole to coordinate and synthesize the views which may have developed in the smaller groups. Also a meeting of the whole will be desirable for transacting necessary business of the Association. If it is desirable to have sub-groups for discussion, then the Executive Committee should designate some capable leaders for them.

2. Our Committee considered several possible themes for the 1952 meeting and suggests the following for consideration of the Executive Committee.

Our first preference would be: *The Place of Moral and Spiritual Values in Higher Education*. In this connection, we would suggest the idea of making a two- or three-year plan around this theme, selecting one or two topics for 1952 and reserving certain others for subsequent years, with some announcement of the plan, so that it will not be felt that a full coverage is needed in any one year.

Another possible central theme would be: *The Library of a Church-Related College: How Can It Be Made to Render Its Maximum Service for Christian Higher Education?* It was our thought that this could be the beginning of a series

of related topics for successive years, first taking the College Library, then certain fields of study in which the possibilities would be explored for the development of maximum usefulness in higher education that is definitely Christian. Fields such as history, economics, humanities, etc., could be used in successive years. As the Library covers all of them, it would be a good means of introducing the series. We have some ideas on how this theme might be developed, which we would be glad to present to you if your Executive Committee should prefer this over our first suggestion.

3. Now for some additional suggestions from the Committee, which we think might improve the situation and perhaps help to get us out of the rut which some seem to think we are in.

a. Eliminate the feature of Resolutions, except as something may be necessary in the way of expressing appreciation and thanks. Since the meeting is brief and does not represent an official organization, it is our feeling that resolutions in the usual sense of the word are not of great value and sometimes cause serious misunderstandings.

b. The officers of our Organization, or any committee which may be created for program planning, should go to work soon after the end of one annual meeting to prepare for the next year, so that good plans can be made.

EXPERIENCE COUNTS IN COLLEGE FUND-RAISING

The Founders of Ward, Wells, Dreshman & Reinhardt were the first to apply the organized method of fund-raising to meet College needs.

Many millions have been raised in campaigns directed by this firm for various types of Educational Institutions—mainly Church-related Colleges and Seminaries.



OVER 40 YEARS OF SUCCESSFUL EXPERIENCE lies back of every fund-raising effort directed by Ward, Wells, Dreshman & Reinhardt.

THE FIRM'S RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT is attested by hundreds of commendations by grateful clients.

A PROVEN SERVICE inspirational as well as efficient, reasonable in cost—creating lasting good will.

CONSULTATION WITHOUT OBLIGATION

If advised of the character of the need, a consultation and preliminary study may be arranged without obligation.

**WARD, WELLS, DRESHMAN
& REINHARDT**

30 Rockefeller Plaza

New York 20, N. Y.

*Charter member of The American Association
of Fund-Raising Counsel.*